THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE name of William BARCLAY has become a very familiar one in the churches of Great Britain in recent years. This is partly because of his regular contributions to ' The British Weekly ', but even more because of his ' Bible Studies '. These were first issued in pamphlet form by the Church of Scotland to help those who wished to have guidance in systematic Bible Reading. Since then, however, they have been published in book form, and have been accorded an enthusiastic welcome in all branches of the Christian Church. The studies concentrate on the central factors of the Christian faith, and are free from any recognizable denominational bias. They have proved themselves extremely valuable especially to ministers, lay preachers and leaders of fellowship groups, for they provide ready-to-hand the means for effectively expounding the message of the various books of the New Testament. Many different reviewers have marvelled at the felicitous touch with which Dr. BARCLAY illumines the word of Scripture, and the rare combination in him of expert knowledge and the ability to communicate it pleasantly and understandably to the ordinary reader.

These same qualities characterize a new book from his pen, entitled *The Mind of Paul*.[1] Though many other books have been written on this theme, there is nevertheless a freshness and lightness of touch about this book which make it a delight to read. It is not addressed either to the scholar or the student reading for examinations. It does not concern itself with problems arising from Paul's letters. It is a book for the preacher and fellowship leader, or indeed for the general reader who seeks a clearer and more comprehensive grasp of the Apostle's teaching. The author himself warns us that his book does not aim to be ' a complete theology of Paul ', and we shall indeed look in vain for any full discussion of more abstract themes, such as predestination or the wrath ; but the central aspects of Paul's message receive heart-warming as well as lucid exposition—such aspects for instance as The Divine Initiative, The Person and Work of Christ, The Gift of the Holy Spirit, Grace, Faith, etc. It is clear that Dr. BARCLAY is able to write on these themes not only as one who understands with his mind, but also rejoices over them in his heart.

Most of the chapters have already appeared as articles in ' The British Weekly ', and will be the more welcomed because they are already known. Two chapters, however, are printed in the book for the first time, and it may be well to present excerpts from these chapters, in order to give readers the savour of the book as a whole.

One of these chapters has to do with Paul's thought about Sin. We learn that it is a plague from which no human being is immune ; it is fraught with distressful consequences ; it is provoked in man by a ' kind of personal demonic power which invades a man and takes up its residence in him.' The word which Paul uses most frequently for ' sin ' is ἁμαρτία. It occurs no fewer than sixty-two times in his letters, though, significantly enough, forty-eight of them are to be found in Romans. This was not originally an ethical word but was used in shooting, and meant to ' miss the target '. The implication behind the word, when it is used to mean ' sin ', is that there is an aim set before human life, which man is constantly failing to reach. As Paul himself puts it, he comes short of the glory of God (Ro 3^{23}). ' Sin is therefore failure to be what we were meant to be ; sin is falling below one's possibilities.' This thought of sin Dr. BARCLAY uses most effectively to insist that sin is not only doing what we ought not to do, but failing to do and to be what we ought to do and to be. ' To fail to do one's best as a workman, to fail to be as good a father, mother, son, daughter as one might have been, to fail to use and to develop the gifts of hand and eye and mind and brain that

[1] Collins ; 16s. net.

God has given us, in any way to fall short of the best that we could be is sin. Disobedience to God means failure in life ; and failure to hit the target is sin.' This does not exhaust the meaning of sin, and we are reminded of other words for it which imply transgression and law-breaking, but it is well to be so forcibly reminded that sin is very commonly to be found not so much in the wrong we do as the good we fail to do.

The second of the two new chapters deals with what Paul teaches about the Church. This was a theme on which he had much to say. Sufficient evidence of this is the fact that in his letters the word ἐκκλησία occurs sixty times. The meaning of the word in Hebrew and Greek antecedents is carefully examined. For the Jews it meant ' the assembled people of God ' and for the Greeks a ' gathering of free citizens '. The Church, therefore, is the New Israel, and also the company of free men who enjoy the privilege of citizenship in the Kingdom of God.

Three different words, each with its own special emphasis, are used to express the quality of life expected of a member of the Church. Such people are ' saints ' (ἅγιοι). ' The basic idea in this word is the idea of difference from ordinary things, that of being set apart from ordinary purposes.' Church members are meant to be different from other men, because they are ' Christ's dedicated people '. They are also described as ' brethren '. ' The Church is meant to be the family of God, in which men are brethren one of another. When a Church is divided in spirit and heart, when bitterness has invaded its fellowship, when the unforgiving spirit has caused breaches which remain unhealed, the Church ceases to be a Church, for a Church is no Church unless it be a brotherhood.' The third characteristic of Church members is that they are ' believers '. ' That is to say, the Church member is the man who accepts what Jesus Christ says as true, and who lives his life on the confident assumption that it is true. The Christian is the man who is convinced that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of his soul, and who has made Jesus Christ the Lord of his life.'

Consideration is also given to the meaning of Church as the local congregation and also as Church Universal. The significance of this larger concept is expounded under its description by Paul as the Body of Christ and the Bride of Christ.

The book attempts no speculative answers to undecided questions and no elaboration of novelties of interpretation, but sets before its readers a sensible, wholesome and very readable presentation of some of the main emphases of Paul's missionary message. It is an excellent little handbook of what John Wesley would have called ' practical divinity '.

Canon A. P. SHEPHERD's new book [1] is obviously controversial in tone and substance. But in this note we are not proposing to draw attention to the controversial parts but to discuss matters of interest which are related to the controversial issue but may well be considered separately.

The claim is made on the dust-cover that it is a revolutionary book, and that it has some things to say that have not yet been said. The former claim would be hard to substantiate for a book on such a subject ; but the second claim appears to be true. The book is a contribution to the discussions which have arisen in the Church of England over the regulations concerning marriage and divorce which are set out in the Act of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1957. Setting these particular issues aside we draw attention to two matters, one a practical proposal and the other a question of Scriptural interpretation and even translation.

The practical suggestion that Canon SHEPHERD makes is that a change should be introduced into the marriage service with the quite definite purpose of confronting the parties concerned with the obligations that devolve upon them through their decision to have their marriage solemnized with Christian rites. Those who choose to do that are by that very fact involving the Church in the sanctity of their vows, and involving the Church in their tragedy if the marriage breaks down. That may reasonably be held to imply that it is their duty, if they see any threat to the continuance of their marriage, to seek at once the Church's counsel and help available to them through their local clergyman or through some Christian counsellor with whom he may put them in touch. If they should do that, there is a good chance that the marriage may be saved from disaster. Even if that should unhappily not prove to be the case, yet the fact that they, or one of them, had sought the Church's help would of itself be proof that that one, at any rate, regarded marriage in a Christian light and took the vows seriously. Further, if the question of re-marriage should arise for one or both, the Church would be in a much better position to judge of the sincerity of the parties and of the likelihood

[1] *Marriage Was Made For Man* (Methuen; 8s. 6d. net.).

that a second marriage would be entered upon in a truly Christian spirit. Not, indeed, that this procedure would prove an infallible touchstone in all cases. Shyness and other reasons might hinder the initial approach. Nevertheless it might come to be recognized as reasonable that normally the Church would not admit to another marriage in church those who had allowed the break-up of their former marriage without, at an early stage, seeking the Church's help.

Canon SHEPHERD's suggestion accordingly is that in the marriage service there should be a charge to the whole congregation present—thus avoiding any appearance of a special warning to the bride and bridegroom—in some such terms as these—'Dearly beloved, the solemn vows and promises, which those who are married in church make each to the other in the sight of God, are of deep concern not only to themselves, but also to the whole Church. . . . It is therefore incumbent upon those who are married, if at any time circumstances should arise which appear to them to threaten the stability of their marriage, that as soon as possible, and before any other action is taken, they should seek counsel and advice on the matter from their parish priest or the bishop or some one appointed by him. Those who suffer their marriage to break down without giving the Church the opportunity of helping them to preserve it, cannot be regarded by the Church as holding in their hearts with any sincerity their responsibility as Christians towards Christ's ideal of marriage. . . .'

The other point to which we desire to draw attention is Canon SHEPHERD's argument that our Lord, on the evidence of the New Testament, did not forbid divorce and re-marriage absolutely, though He did deny the right of either party to dissolve a marriage of their own will alone, which was the point of the question put to Him in the matter. Some justification for this view he finds even in the saying which appears in our Bible as 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder'. That has generally been interpreted in Western Europe as a total prohibition. Canon SHEPHERD, however, maintains that the proper translation is 'What God hath joined together, let not a man put asunder'—that is to say, in the context, a married man, a husband. What our Lord is forbidding is the right of a husband to put away his wife and so dissolve his own marriage.

We must refer readers to Canon SHEPHERD's own pages for the discussion of the complexities of Jewish law and custom and of Greek usages which are involved here. We simply point out that if this translation should commend itself as probable or even possible, then we have a solution to something in the New Testament that seems strange. If our Lord forbade divorce absolutely, how could St. Paul, writing little more than twenty years later, allow an exception to that rule in the Corinthian Church, the so-called 'Pauline privilege' of 1 Co 7^{15}? The fact that St. Paul does so seems to confirm the view that our Lord was not understood in the earliest days of the Church to have pronounced an absolute negative. Further confirmation is found in the tradition of the Eastern Church which never took the rigorist standpoint in this matter and still allows divorce on certain grounds and the re-marriage, under certain conditions, of both parties. It is sometimes said that this tradition arose through the weak complaisance of the Church in face of the secular legislation of Justinian in the sixth century. Canon SHEPHERD denies that this is an accurate presentation of the historical situation. The problem was to relate the frailty of human nature to Christ's denial of the right of husband or wife to dissolve their marriage by putting away their partner at their own will, at a time when this was in the Roman world the normal form of divorce. The Code of Justinian recognized the Christian ideal that marriage was for life and could not be dissolved either by mutual consent or by the sole action of one party. It did, however, allow certain grounds for divorce, among them adultery. Such regulated divorce was not regarded as a concession to State authority but as an expression of the Christian standard of marriage in the legislation of the State, taking into account the frailty of human nature.

If it could be established, as Canon SHEPHERD holds, that the difference of view between the Eastern and the Western Church arose through a mistaken interpretation of Christ's teaching in the West, that would greatly relieve the tension of conflicting views in the minds of Christian people. Even if this should not be acceptable to other scholars, the practical suggestion that the Church should endeavour to get the opportunity to exercise her influence where the problem is actually being faced between husband and wife before divorce proceedings are contemplated, seems eminently wise. It might save many marriages from breaking-up: it would probably meet with the approval even of those who do not accept the Church's standards; and it might blunt the edge of the charge that the Church's attitude is too much one of condemnation.

Church and Ministry—The Apostolic Succession Reconsidered

By the Reverend J. G. Davies, D.D., Senior Lecturer in Theology, The University of Birmingham

The coinherence of Christian doctrine, that is to say the interdependence of the various aspects of belief, makes it all but impossible to examine any one element in isolation. Indeed to do so is to be guilty of an abstraction and, in particular, to consider the ministry apart from the Church is to endorse a dichotomy which should never exist. The ministry has no *raison d'être* apart from the Church and, further, one's understanding of the nature of the latter will inevitably influence one's interpretation of the former. Hence before reviewing the ministry in terms of the Apostolic Succession something must be said, however briefly, concerning the doctrine of the Church.

At the present day scholars tend to belong to two camps,[1] depending upon their answer to the question: Is St. Paul's term 'the body of Christ' a metaphor or not? Those who support the metaphorical interpretation advance two main arguments: first, while acknowledging that in the first century the modern analytical distinction between metaphor and reality was not appreciated, they contend that certain images are clearly to be understood metaphorically, for example, the Church as an olive tree in Ro 11, and that this applies equally to 'Body'; second, that a collection of men and women is demonstrably not a 'Body'. The first of these arguments involves a logical *non sequitur*, for the fact that St. Paul on occasion uses terms in a manner that can be described legitimately as metaphorical does not mean that every term is so to be understood; this is to argue in a circle and to assume what is to be proved. The second argument would seem to rest upon a misinterpretation of the Hebrew manner of thought and expression and to substitute for it a modern predominantly scientific and Hellenic viewpoint. The Hebrew, unlike the Greek, is not interested in things in themselves but only in things as they are called to be. He is not concerned with an object as such but with what it becomes in relation to its final reference according to the Divine purpose. The meaning of an object therefore does not lie in its analytical and empirical reality but in the will that is expressed by it. Hence Jesus could say of a piece of bread: 'This is my body'. The bread does not cease to be bread but it becomes what it is not, namely, the instrument and organ of His presence, because through His sovereign word He has given it a new dimension.[2] Hence, too, St. Paul could say of a collection of money: 'This is the *koinonia*'. The money does not cease to be money but it becomes what it is not, namely, the means of furthering the *koinonia* of Jew and Gentile, because its nature lies in the Divine intention that is realised through it.[3] Similarly the Church is the Body of Christ because its true nature rests upon its relation to God's purpose. Understood in this way the opposition between metaphor and non-metaphor is seen to be an unreal one. St. Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, regards the Church as the organ of Christ's presence uniting His members to Himself and in Him to one another. Just then as the body is not only the sign of a man's presence but also the organ, because a man *has not* a body but *is* a body, so the Church is the sign and organ of Christ's presence.

The bearing of this upon our understanding of the ministry must now be examined. Since the Church is the organ of Christ's presence, it must be visible; it must be identifiable, it must therefore have a structure. This structure is not provided by the Bible which is the Church's Book written by members of the Old and New Israel for their fellow-believers and is not to be divorced from the continuous life of the Church in which it was canonised. Nor is it the Creeds which are the confessions of that faith upon which the Church's life depends. Nor again is it the gospel Sacraments, of which the one is the gateway to the Church and the other the source of the renewal

[1] Cf. E. Best, *One Body in Christ* [1955], 98 ff. and J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* [1952], 51 ff.

[2] O. Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, 'Essays on the Lord's Supper', in *Ecumenical Studies in Worship*, i. [1958], 44 ff.

[3] J. G. Davies, *Members One of Another: Aspects of Koinonia* [1958], 29–32.

of its vitality. It is rather the ministry which reveals the Church's identity and ensures its historical continuity.

What, then, of the Apostolic Succession? Apostolic Succession is patient of two different interpretations. One of these—the so-called 'pipe line' theory—has already been devastatingly criticised by Professor Barrett last month in this journal and the present writer is in general agreement with his negative arguments. The second one long ago received clear expression in the contribution by Dr. C. H. Turner to H. B. Swete's *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* ([1918], pp. 93–196) and was made the basis of his exposition of orders by Professor O. C. Quick, most fully in *The Christian Sacraments* ([1927], pp. 123–154) and more succintly in his *Doctrines of the Creed* ([1938], pp. 330–341). Since Professor Barrett has largely ignored this interpretation and since it remains acceptable to many, a renewed exposition of it is required if only that none of the issues connected with Apostolic Succession should be evaded.

Apostolic Succession as it was first understood, at least from the second century, was not primarily sacramental but historical. 'The original idea of the Succession meant succession to a particular chair, to the bishopric of a particular church, and not simply to the possession of episcopal orders'.[1] The Succession was thus not from consecrator to consecrated—the 'pipe line' theory—but from holder to holder and involved no mechanistic conception. The bishop of any community had been put in possession of the *cathedra* or teaching chair in succession to a predecessor who in his turn had been the recognised holder of the chair and so on back to the foundation of the community. If the Church had been founded or organised by an apostle, then there was a direct formal connexion between its episcopate in any age and the apostles in the first days after Pentecost; if the Church was the offshoot of another, then the daughter Church could trace its succession back via its own bishops and those of the mother Church to the apostles. So the Church of Canterbury to-day can trace its succession back from Archbishop Fisher to Archbishop Temple to Archbishop Lang and so back to Augustine and from Augustine to Gregory, who sent him, and from Gregory back to Peter and Paul. Such office holders are in the succession of the apostles although not the successors of the apostles, *i.e.*, each bishop is not another apostle or member of the apostolic college. By this means, so it is contended, the Church manifests a structure and preserves a necessary historical link with the age of the apostles—this historical link being necessary because the continuity of the Church does not rest upon the perpetuation of a creed or of a body of tenets but of a society to whose life the events of the past are essential present realities.

[1] Turner, *op. cit.*, 142.

It will be immediately apparent that the theory just outlined is not open to what would seem to be the fatal objection to the 'pipe line' view, namely, that the Apostolic Succession would no longer exist if there had been any break in the chain, and that there has been no break rests upon an assumption as to what happened in the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods which the historical evidence does not appear to warrant. All that this theory requires is the recognition that Christ intended to found a Church—a view which it has been fashionable to deny but which is now becoming generally accepted—that the apostles formed the primitive nucleus of this Church, over which they possessed a certain authority and oversight, and that from them the Church has grown and developed to manifest the monepiscopal structure of the late first and second centuries A.D.

Such a statement however raises an important question which must not be by-passed: how did and how does a bishop enter upon the Apostolic Succession? The first requisite is the choice and election, not by ballot but by acclamation, of the local church;[2] the second is the authorization of the candidate to occupy the *cathedra* and this authorization is given by those who themselves have been authorized so to do, namely, neighbouring bishops. We are thus faced with another problem: whence did the bishops obtain this authority? There are those who would reply that it comes from the apostles; that they themselves, having been commissioned by Jesus, commissioned others to carry on the pastoral oversight of the Church;[3] these were the ministerial organs of the Church who were authorized to ordain and in course of time received the title of bishop. The difficulty with this position is that it seems to be the 'pipe line' theory all over again, applied to the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods, and while the emphasis is laid upon authorization, rather than on the communication of a *charisma*, nevertheless any break in the line of authorizers would mean that some had been authorized by those who had no authority so to do. There is, however, an alternative approach to this question of authority. As Head of the Church it is Christ Himself who gives authority

[2] See A. J. Maclean in *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern*, ed. C. Jenkins and K. D. Mackenzie [1930], 47–50.

[3] A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* [1958], 327.

to His ministers ; but since Christ's vicegerent on earth is the Holy Spirit and since the Holy Spirit is immanent in the Church, the authority must come through the Church ; the Church is thus the immediate medium of authorization.[1] This theological statement is in accord with what is known of the historical facts. The record shows the Church emerging from the womb of the Apostolic Age, under the sovereign rule of Christ and by the guidance of the Spirit, as a visible organism with the bishop empowered as its organ of authorization—he and he alone for at least thirteen hundred years, *i.e.*, up to the Reformation, is universally regarded as the representative and organ of the whole body ministerially empowered to ordain and consecrate. He has been so authorized, we may legitimately hold, by Christ through the Spirit in the Church—whether or not the initial media of this Divine action were the apostles is a question which it is difficult, if not impossible, to answer and in any case is not of the first importance for the conception of the Apostolic Succession just outlined.

It now remains to point out certain corollaries of this position to avoid misunderstanding.

1. Since the essence of Apostolic Succession, as defined, lies in authorization and since this depends upon the Church, this authorization may be withdrawn, *i.e.*, a bishop who leaves the Church ceases to have that authority that pertains to him as long as he is in the Church ; he is no longer in the Apostolic Succession.

2. Consequently possession of so-called ' valid ' orders, in the Roman sense of orders within the ' pipe line ' Apostolic Succession, does not guarantee that a particular group of Christians is within the Catholic Church. It is not the bishops who make the Church the Church, although they may be regarded as an element that should manifest its identity.

3. Since the basis of Apostolic Succession as defined is authorization, in a divided Church, as it is to-day, no group that has preserved it, being in internal schism with another, can be said to possess it in its wholeness, because the authorization can only be a matter of degree, *i.e.*, divided Christendom sets limits to the authority given.

4. Whereas Apostolic Succession manifests the structure of the visible Church yet since (*a*) it is not preserved unimpaired by anyone and (*b*) the Church is dismembered through internal schism, emphasis upon it does not unchurch those who do not have it—for where indeed, disregarding the claims of Rome and Eastern Orthodoxy, is the *Church* to-day, the *One* Body of Christ ?—because groups of non-episcopal polity may well have retained or restored other elements in the Church's order which have been lost or obscured where the episcopal succession has been kept.[2]

5. A group in schism, after careful examination of matters of faith, worship, etc., would then need to recognize another as a part of the Church, and the ministers of the one would have to receive authorization from those of the other and vice versa if any reunion, which is more than nominal, were to be effected.

The Church of England, so the writer believes, has preserved the Apostolic Succession, although impaired ; this emphasis upon the organic nature of the Church and upon historical continuity is something of value which it has to contribute to any reunited ' Church ', and to treat it as a matter of indifference is, for Anglicans, to be disloyal to their forebears in the faith and ungrateful for the inheritance which by the chances of history—or may one say, through the guidance of providence ?—has come down to them. Granted that many bishops in the Apostolic Succession have not been faithful guardians of orthodoxy and have not always revealed themselves as centres of unity, this is no argument against the need for some unity of organization recognized as authoritative if the Church is to fulfil her apostolic mission, it is rather a recognition of man's sin and a warning that judgment will begin at the House of God. To say that the Church of England has preserved, impaired, the Apostolic Succession, which it is eager to share with those that have it not,[3] is not to demonstrate its self-sufficiency but to call attention to its inadequacy as a divided member of the one Church of God. It is this last blasphemous fact that gives to all theological thinking a certain air of abstract theorizing which may achieve logicality only by disregarding both the existence of internal schism and the consequent fragmentation of truth, of which no ' church ' has a monopoly, and it cannot achieve an integrated wholeness until the Church herself has been reintegrated into wholeness.

[1] Any antithesis between authority from above and from below is therefore a false one.

[2] That continuity of doctrine should be preserved even at the cost of continuity of visible structure is certainly a tenable view common to many heirs of the Reformation, but this justification of past action should not be allowed to impede the movement towards future unity in which, the writer believes, visible structure will have its part to play.

[3] Though not necessarily in the constitutional form it has assumed in the Church of England to-day.

Milestones in Books. VIII.

By the Reverend Dr. Vincent Taylor, F.B.A.[1]

The books that have influenced me most in my thinking are theological and expository, but I must not forget to mention the debt I owe to the poets, to whom I was introduced by a College friend. Among these was William Watson, the austere beauty of whose poems made a deep impression upon my mind. Greater was the influence of Browning and, in particular, his *Ring and the Book*. Along with this poem I read *The Old Yellow Book*, and I owe not a little to the depositions contained in this volume for my abiding interest in source criticism. In the Classics my imagination was captured by Vergil's *Aeneid*, and I found as a boy how moving and attractive many of Cicero's Epistles could be, especially, strange as it may sound, *De Senectute*.

About the age of seventeen the first serious theological book which I read was James Denney's *The Death of Christ*, and I must name this as my first milestone. I was fascinated by it, partly by its style but more by its solid matter. What youth could resist such a passage (on the Pastoral Epistles) as 'St. Paul was inspired, but the writer of these epistles is sometimes only orthodox'? It was to the Presbyterian Denney, and not to Anglican theologians, that I owe my views regarding the close connexion between the Eucharist and the doctrine of the Atonement. 'The sacraments', Denney wrote, 'but especially the sacrament of the Supper, are the stronghold of the New Testament doctrine concerning the death of Christ.' In the course of time I came to value other books of his, *Jesus and the Gospel*, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, and his masterly commentary on *Romans* in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, but the most formative influence I received was from *The Death of Christ*.

A second milestone was the reading of the works of William Sanday of Oxford and the study of James Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ* was to be a revelation of what method and critical insight could be. Later I read with avidity his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, which introduced me to the works of Johannes Weiss, W. Wrede, and W. Bousset, and later his *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, but above all his great commentary on *Romans* in the *International Critical Commentary* series which, with so many more, has remained a lifelong companion. Along with these I must mention a pamphlet now almost forgotten, *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism*, an essay which in temper and spirit is a model of the manner in which controversy should be conducted. I have always felt that it is a great loss to critical New Testament scholarship that no one has written a careful and detailed account of Sanday's work during the difficult period 1880–1920. We must be thankful, however, for Dr. A. Plummer's three valuable articles on 'William Sanday and his

[1] The Rev. Dr. Vincent Taylor was accepted into the ministry of the Methodist Church in 1906. He received his theological training at Richmond College, Surrey, and gained his B.D. degree and also the B.D. Honours Degree at London University. His first book on *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* gained for him the Ph.D., and the degree of D.D. was awarded in recognition of his book, *Behind the Third Gospel*, in which he worked out in detail what has become known as the Proto-Luke Theory. His high standing in the world of New Testament scholarship was recognized by his appointment as Tutor in New Testament studies at Headingley College, Leeds, in 1930, and six years later he was appointed Principal. This position he held with great distinction until his retirement in 1953. Both during his teaching career and also since his retirement he has written many important books, some on New Testament subjects, others on Theology, and still others of a more elementary type for the general reader, the lay preacher and students. In 1933 his book on *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* provided the first introduction for many English readers to the new approach to the Gospels known as 'Form Criticism'. Then came his famous trilogy on the Atonement—*Jesus and His Sacrifice*, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*. More recently he delivered the Speaker's Lectures at Oxford and these have appeared as a further trilogy on the Person of Christ—*The Names of Jesus*, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, and *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*. In 1952 appeared his magnificent commentary on *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. In 1956 he spent several months at Drew University as visiting lecturer, and a special series of lectures delivered there have been published under the title, *The Cross of Christ*. Several Universities, including Glasgow, Leeds and Dublin, have awarded him the honorary D.D., and a still further honour was conferred upon him when he was made a Fellow of the British Association. The Expository Times and many other learned journals have frequently published articles from his pen.—Editor.

Work ' in The Expository Times (xxxii. [1920–21]), which are full of interest and information. In a tribute to Sanday's memory in *The British Weekly* (Sept. 23, 1920) Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet compared the Oxford scholar with Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort, and wrote :

> He had most in common with Hort, the most penetrating mind of the three, ' the scholar's scholar '. But he added to Hort's qualities of fine discrimination that lucidity of expression and literary style in which Lightfoot had the advantage over Hort. On the whole, however, it was Hort's temper of unresting inquiry, with a view ultimately to the big, abiding, fundamental theological issues, behind all biblical studies and all historical developments of Church doctrine and institutions, that appeared more and more plainly in him, marking the true affinity between the two scholars.

This discerning judgment from a nonconformist scholar adequately sums up the abiding impression which Sanday left upon many of us. I think I could identify an unnamed page of Sanday's writings at sight, but it is to his treatment of ' the big, abiding, fundamental theological issues ' that I am indebted most of all. I met him only once, and I shall never forget his patient explanation of his well-known phrase ' a reduced Christology ' by which he meant a Christology not in harmony with the Creeds.

My next milestone was B. H. Streeter's *The Four Gospels : A Study of Origins*. Undoubtedly this work was the outstanding contribution to the study of the Gospels in its period and, I think, is still of the greatest importance to literary and historical criticism. Its defence of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, to which I was first introduced by Streeter's suggestive article in *The Hibbert Journal* on the subject in October 1921, interested me profoundly, but no less influential was Streeter's stimulating presentation of Textual Criticism, especially the importance he found in the effect of the great Churches of Alexandria, Cæsarea, Antioch, Carthage, and Rome upon the history of the text of the New Testament. Although I had gained much from the works of Westcott and Hort, Gregory, Kenyon, and Lake, it is to Streeter's contribution that I trace my abiding interest in this subject. I was also deeply indebted to his discussion of the Lucan Passion narrative which followed upon the contributions of A. M. Perry, J. C. Hawkins, and others, and is supplemented now by the works of W. Bussmann, J. Jeremias, and H. Schürmann, and I do not think that the criticisms which have been brought against this hypothesis are likely to prevail. It is natural that scholars rightly impressed by the immense value of the Marcan narrative should hesitate to recognize the existence of other Passion narratives, but the future seems to me to lie with those who affirm that several of the great Churches, although dependent upon Mark, already had Passion narratives of their own, and that even Mark itself presupposes an earlier narrative. Streeter's Four Document hypothesis has been widely accepted, but is still in need of further discussion.

I place the next milestone in the slim volume of Dr. Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, to which Dr. W. F. Howard drew my attention in 1928. This first edition was followed later by the revised and enlarged second edition, translated with the collaboration of the author by Professor B. F. Woolf in the well-known book, *From Tradition to Gospel*, in 1934, but although I learned much from the later volume, it is the first edition, despite its brevity, which influenced me most. It was bold, ingenious, and constructive. I think it was in this book that I first lighted upon the word *kerygma* now so popular, and it was from the reading of it that I came to realize the influence which the first preaching, described in the early chapters in the Acts and in 1 Co 15 and other passages in the Epistles, must have exerted upon the formation of the Gospel tradition. ' In the beginning was the sermon ' is the historic phrase with which E. Fascher described this emphasis in the work of Dibelius. I soon came to see that other factors besides preaching had to be taken into account—teaching, controversy, discussion, and worship—and, what is more important, that it was not enough to think of the earliest tradition as consisting of a mass of single fragments. From Dibelius and K. L. Schmidt I learned that the Passion narrative existed as a connected account from the first, since only by telling the story as a whole could the first Christians understand how it was that Jesus, who went about doing good, came to His tragic death upon the Cross. From Dibelius and Schmidt I moved on to Bultmann, Albertz, Bertram, Koehler, Easton, Grant, and the rest. New Testament research, it was obvious, was moving into a new field which gave promise of a deeper insight into the life and problems of the Christian community, and which raised the difficult, but fascinating, question of the influence which the community had upon the elucidation and the obscuring of the tradition. It was interesting and instructive to observe how easily the new wine intoxicated many students and led them to forget, or to ignore, the existence of eye-witnesses in the earliest decades and the conserving effects of teaching and worship. I found the distinction between *Paradigmen* (' models ' or ' pronouncement-stories ') and *Novellen* (' tales ') illuminating, but the treatment of the sayings-tradition and of myths did not seem to me to add much to the

ordinary principles of literary and historical criticism. While grateful for the new insights gained through Form-criticism, I did not lose my interest in source-criticism, and it seems to me that the comparative neglect of this discipline, which continues to the present day, is harmful to the best interests of Synoptic studies. How sad it is that we have to return once more to the defence of Q, M, and L, and even to rebut the delusion that the later evangelists used Matthew as a source!

It is not easy to find the next milestone in a single book. Several, in fact, contributed to a growing and permanent interest in New Testament theology. I gained not a little from Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*, which unfortunately has never been translated, and from J. Weiss's *Das Urchristentum*, translated in *The History of Primitive Christianity* by four American scholars. The main interest of British scholars appeared to be the refutation of Bousset's claim that the use of the *Kyrios* title in primitive Christianity was due to pagan influences, but although this hypothesis was brilliantly refuted by A. E. J. Rawlinson and others, who found the 'Achilles' heel' in the currency of the cry '*Marana tha*' in Aramaic-speaking Christian worship, its decisive refutation tended to obscure the great emphasis which Bousset laid upon the worship of Christ as 'the Lord' in the first Hellenistic communities. Who could fail to be arrested by his forthright claim: 'The Jesus Paul knows is the pre-existent supramundane Christ, who was rich and became poor for our sakes, who was in the divine form and assumed the form of a servant, the Son of God whom the Father gave as an offering, the One who fulfils the prophecies and completes the promises'?

But other books besides Bousset's determined my interest in New Testament theology. In 1930 I had been much impressed by F. C. N. Hicks' *Fullness of Sacrifice*, and this interest was deepened by E. O. James' *Origins of Sacrifice: A Study in Comparative Religion*, which led me to study again G. Buchanan Gray's *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice*, R. C. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality* and J. McLeod Campbell's *Nature of the Atonement*. No doubt the detailed picture which Bishop Hicks gave of an ancient Hebrew offering was composite, but it seemed to me to throw much light upon the Passion sayings of Jesus and the doctrine of the Atonement. More formative, however, in their influence were Joachim Jeremias' *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* [1935] (Eng. Tr. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* [1955]), Rudolf Otto's *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* [1933] (Eng. Tr. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* [1938]). To these I must add, as regards Christology, H. R. Mackintosh's *Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* and P. T. Forsyth's *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*.

Many other works have broadened my studies, but as milestones those I have mentioned stand out, and I am grateful for the opportunity which this series affords to mention them and also to commend them to others.

Literature

CORPORATE MAN

THE potentialities of St. Paul for discussion and appraisal seem to be inexhaustible. Dr. William Barclay's recent survey of St. Paul's thought has been followed quickly by Dr. R. P. Shedd's study of the Pauline use of Hebrew and Jewish conceptions of human solidarity. *Man in Community* (Epworth Press; 30s. net), more restricted in scope and more systematic in treatment, argues for the understanding of the Apostle's theology in terms of his doctrine of human solidarity *in a purely Hebraic context*.

The Old Testament evidence shows that the Israelite mind, thinking in terms of organic unity, saw the individual life as part of the race which has a life of its own. In later Judaism there were various modifications, Rabbinic, Apocalyptic and Essene, of the earlier thinking. Contacts with the outer world gave an awareness of the individual which brought the older concepts under criticism. Nevertheless there were other factors which established the corporate unity of Israel as a theological fact. Here are the sources of the ideas of solidarity in Paul's letters. Only in this context can we rightly understand his views on human and cosmic unity. Dr. Shedd does not claim that Paul merely repeated Jewish ideas of racial solidarity but that these provided the background for the realistic view of the total human implication in sin, on which his doctrine of redemption was based, and for his doctrine of the saved and saving community.

From this well-argued thesis, Dr. Shedd has much to say about the Church: the new Humanity in Christ, the true eschatological Israel. What he says is highly relevant both to the current discussions on the unity of the Church and to the understanding of Faith, as the fact constitutive of membership; of Baptism, as its outward means; and of the Eucharist, which creates the realization of the solidarity of the members in the Body and their fellowship with the Head.

The argument, based on selective but representative evidence, is made to appear less massive than it is by the author's careful deployment of facts and the breaking down into a series of minor theses and conclusions. The effect is to endorse and reinforce Wheeler Robinson's doctrine of 'corporate personality'. It is perhaps surprising that Dr. Shedd does not make more use of the use of the 'societary' idea in Ryder Smith's works, which he quotes in minor contexts, and which anticipate many of his conclusions. MARCUS WARD

DOCUMENTS FROM OLD TESTAMENT TIMES

Until comparatively recently students who wished to study at first-hand the documents of the civilizations of the ancient Near East for the light which these might throw on the background of the Old Testament, were obliged to depend on the excellent collection of documents and illustrations in Gressmann and Ebeling's 'Texte und Bilde zum Alten Testament'. This was only of use to students who could read German, and it was published in 1909 (2nd edition in 1926). Since then an immense amount of new material has accumulated, and new translations of the most important texts have appeared. Then, in 1950, American scholarship, aided by American wealth, under the very able editorship of Professor James B. Pritchard, produced the splendid volume entitled 'Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament', followed in 1954 by an equally fine volume entitled 'The Ancient Near East in Pictures relating to the Old Testament', under the same editorship. These two volumes have superseded Gressmann, and have quickly become standard works of reference. But these two volumes comprised 526+350 pages, and while far from expensive considering the wealth of their contents, were beyond the purse of the average student. Now British scholarship, under the skilled editorship of Professor D. Winton Thomas, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, has produced a book which all students of the Old Testament will hail with delight. Its title is *Documents from Old Testament Times* (Nelson; 18s. net). It contains translated texts from cuneiform, Egyptian, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Moabite, and Aramaic documents and inscriptions, together with sixteen full-page illustrations. Each text has a short but useful introduction, and notes are provided at the end of each. There is an excellent index, and a list of Scripture passages referred to. One might almost say, 'all this and heaven too', for the price is astonishingly low, all this for eighteen shillings! The selection of texts has been made with great skill and good judgment, and illustrates every aspect of Israelite history and religion. Many of the texts are, as might be expected, old friends; but most of the old friends appear in a new dress. For instance, Dr. Kinneir Wilson, with great courage, has ventured to give a new translation of those parts of the Akkadian Epic of Creation, and of the Gilgamesh Epic, which he has selected as representative. Any one who cares to make a comparison between his translation and those of Heidel or Speiser will find it of interest. It may be remarked that he rejects the idea of any influence of the Epic of Creation upon the Hebrew account in the first chapter of Genesis.

The so-called Babylonian Ecclesiastes has been preferred to the more familiar *Ludlul bel nimeqi*, which has been called the Babylonian Job. We have our old friends the Mesha Stele, the bibliography to which should surely have included the name of the late Dr. S. R. Driver; the Siloam Inscription, the Stele of Merenptah, and the Gezer Calendar. Dr. Diringer has given some examples of Hebrew seals and weights with useful notes. Dr. Gray has made excellent extracts from the extensive and difficult Ugaritic Literature, with admirable notes. Mention should also be made of Professor McHardy's translation of the Aramaic Saqqarah Letter, of Principal Black's editing of the two important Milqart and Zakir Steles, and of Professor Rowley's treatment of the Elephantiné Papyri. It is a cause for some regret that no space has been found for some extracts from what is now a rich field of Hittite texts, historical, ritual, and legal; the more so since the Hittites played a not inconsiderable part in the history of Israel, and it has even been suggested that Israel learned how to write history from the Hittites.

Professor Winton Thomas is to be warmly congratulated, not only on his own excellent work as editor and contributor, but especially for giving some of our younger British scholars the opportunity to prove that we have no cause to view the future of Old Testament studies with anything but happy expectation.

This book will be an inestimable boon to all Bible students, and its price brings it within the reach of all. Messrs. Nelson are also to be congratulated on the admirable production of the book.

S. H. HOOKE

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN HEBREW

The British and Foreign Bible Society published its first Hebrew Bible nearly a century ago. Known as the 'Letteris Bible', after the editor, Meir Halevy Letteris (1800–1871), it has enjoyed long popularity. The Society next published, in the first decade of this century, a text edited by C. D. Ginsburg, who followed almost entirely the recension of Jacob ben Chayyim, which was generally

thought to represent the true Massoretic text of Ben Asher. Ginsburg's text never had much of a vogue. His method of dealing with manuscripts evoked indeed much criticism. In 1937 the Würtemberg Bible Society published the third edition of Kittel's 'Biblia Hebraica', under the editorship of Dr. P. Kahle, whose work in the field of Massoretic studies has transformed the scene. The basis of this edition is the Leningrad MS., which, Dr. Kahle believes, is the best available representative of the Ben Asher text.

The plates used for the 'Letteris' text being no longer serviceable, the British and Foreign Bible Society decided in 1933 to publish a new text, and they entrusted the task of preparing it to Dr. Norman H. Snaith. Dr. Snaith had in fact completed his main task just before the War, but various difficulties prevented publication until last year. Dr. Snaith's text is not a revision of the 'Letteris' text. Nor is it in any way dependent on the Ginsburg text, nor to any degree on Dr. Kahle's text. It is based on the first hands of Spanish Hebrew manuscripts in the British Museum, especially Or. 2625–7 and Or. 2375, as well as on the Shem Tob MS. which was in the library of the late David Sassoon. Almost all Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible have been 'corrected' so as to conform with the Ben Chayyim text, and these manuscripts have suffered a similar fate. The first hands, however, correspond regularly to the preferred readings of the noted Massoretic scholar Jedidiah Solomon ben Abraham Norzi (1560–1626) in his *Minchat Shai*, and Dr. Snaith believes that they represent the authentic Ben Asher tradition. It is indeed striking that, while Dr. Snaith has worked on quite a different basis from Dr. Kahle, their texts are very close to each other, and this double testimony adds strength to the claim of both editors to have recovered the true Ben Asher text.

The chief difference between the texts of the two editions lies in the closer adherence by Dr. Snaith to Massoretic traditions as to spacing and such like. No Massorah is included, and the footnotes are restricted to official Massoretic notes. The Sedarim (Readings from the Law), together with the traditional divisions of each Seder into seven portions, and the Haftaroth (Readings from the Prophets), are all indicated, and a table of the proper Sedarim and Haftaroth for Sabbaths and Special Days throughout the year, as observed both by Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jews, is provided. A special feature of the text is the great care which has been devoted to the correct placing of the accents, especially in the poetical books.

This successor to the 'Letteris Bible', handy in size, attractively bound, and moderately priced (17s. 6d. net), is sure of a wide circulation, and the many users of it will have good reason to be grateful to the editor and the Bible Society. The task of proof reading, which must have been onerous indeed, has been very well carried through. One has to look hard to spot an occasional broken letter or blurred vowel points.

D. Winton Thomas

EPHESIANS

Dr. John A. Allan, Professor of New Testament Studies in Knox College, Dunedin, has written the commentary on *The Epistle to the Ephesians* in 'The Torch Bible Commentaries' (S.C.M.; 9s. 6d. net). Professor Allan is unable to accept the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, and expounds it as a post-Pauline writing. This gives a particular interest to the commentary, since other commentaries in English are based on the acceptance of Pauline authorship.

In the Introduction he argues his case for the abandonment of Pauline authorship, and adopts, as his explanation of the origin of the Epistle, the theory associated primarily with the name of E. J. Goodspeed. This claims that the Epistle was written after Paul's letters had been collected together, was composed largely of materials derived from the genuine letters, and in the first place was intended to serve as a kind of introduction to the first published Corpus.

In the commentary itself Professor Allan seeks to show how this approach has the effect of illuminating the message of the Epistle. He points to passages where Pauline thought is rephrased so as to make it more intelligible to a later generation (and for that reason more acceptable to modern man as well). For instance, there is the substitution of 'salvation' for 'justification' in 2^5 and 2^8; and the modification both in the meaning attached to the phrase 'in Christ', and in the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ. All these are 'less fresh, original and dynamic than Paul, and reflect a later and less spontaneous type of Church life. But this means that he (the writer) brings Paul's ideas nearer to our present-day needs'.

In the body of the exposition there are included, where they are most relevant, seven very useful short essays on such subjects as the 'in Christ' formula, 'Salvation by Faith', 'The Body of Christ', the Sacraments, and Demonology in Ephesians. In the last of these Professor Allan argues vigorously against a belief in demons or a personal devil, and pleads for a more realistic assessment of the cause of our troubles, and a recognition that our human nature itself is 'really desperately corrupt' and this is the real cause of our distresses.

At many points exegesis kindles into the warmth

of faith and gratitude, and this is indeed a great asset to any commentary. Ephesians 1^{3-14} should, for instance, be read ' as the lyrical effusion of a heart overflowing with the joy of salvation, dazzled and almost confused by the amazing brilliance of what God offers to us in Christ Jesus '. The commentary is greatly enriched also by an abundance of most telling quotations from Calvin : ' Faith is not a distant view, but a warm embrace of Christ by which he dwells in us ', and ' He who knows the love of Christ fully and perfectly is in every respect a wise man. The love of Christ contains within itself the whole wisdom.'

The commentary as a whole makes most interesting and profitable reading. The Epistle is shown to make thoroughly good sense when expounded on the basis of non-Pauline authorship. At the same time it is abundantly clear that, in spite of modifications, the author has succeeded in presenting to us the very heart of the Pauline gospel.

C. L. Mitton

WESLEY AND ROME

It is surely a sign of our ecumenical times that an appreciation of John Wesley should appear from the pen of a Roman Catholic layman. Yet this is the nature of Mr. John M. Todd's book, *John Wesley and the Catholic Church* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 15s. net), and such a generous gesture should be received no less cordially because it is perhaps unexpected. It is not, however, unprecedented, for the exhaustive researches of Maximin Piette have already placed all serious students of the Methodist revival in his debt, and he in turn derived much of his impetus from the prior enquiries of Augustin Léger. More recently, Ronald Knox has sketched a fascinating profile of Wesley in his ' Enthusiasm ' and his treatment of Wesley's doctrine of assurance comes in for some criticism from Mr. Todd. Most significantly of all, so far as this venture is concerned, Louis Bouyer has devoted a section of his ' Du Protestantisme à l'Eglise ' to a consideration of Wesley and, more extensively, has sought to demonstrate that the basic insights of Luther and Calvin were altogether orthodox and that consequently the Reformation message could only find its adequate fulfilment in the Roman Church. Mr. Todd is consciously treading in Bouyer's footsteps as he approaches Wesley from a similar angle. In neither instance are we wholly persuaded by the arguments offered, but the eirenical motive which has prompted these overtures is to be welcomed and commended.

Mr. Todd sets out ' to exonerate Wesley from any substantial doctrinal deviations ', and to discover to what extent the driving force behind his mission was identifiable with that of the Catholic faith. When he is dealing, as he does with laudable sympathy and perception, with Wesley's call to evangelize Britain, his teaching on incarnation and redemption, and even his ideal of holiness—the ' guiding star throughout his life '—Mr. Todd commands our almost unqualified assent. When he endeavours to show that Wesley occupied what he calls a ' providential middle position ' combining respect for ecclesiastical institutions with stress on the necessity of inward experience, we can still stay with him. But it is as he moves from the broadly Catholic to the narrowly Roman that he will doubtless shed his Protestant readers. He believes that Wesley's life was based formally on the assumption that our Lord founded a visible Church. In order to substantiate this claim the author is compelled to magnify Wesley's ecclesiology and at the same time to minimize his breach with traditional Anglicanism. This leads him, for instance, to affirm that ' far too much emphasis has been laid on the almost incidental ordination of priests (*sic*) undertaken by Wesley towards the end of his life ' and that it was ' *only* on historical grounds that he came to the conclusion, subsequently, that it was impossible to prove the apostolic succession ' (italics mine). Still more serious is his failure (with Bouyer) to grasp the determinative significance of justification by faith as *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, and his inability, despite an interesting attempt to interpret Wesley's experience in terms of the mystic way, to recognize a genuine evangelical conversion in the crisis of May 1738.

On p. 23 ' Noncomformists ' is an obvious slip, as is ' Spagenberg ' on p. 58 and Christ Church College on pp. 15, 23 and also in the index. Since, according to Dr. Frank Baker, ' the identification of " Varanese " with Sally Kirkham is practically certain ' it was she and not her sister Betty who introduced Wesley to the writings of Thomas à Kempis (p. 36).

A. Skevington Wood

BAPTIST FAITH AND PRACTICE

Dr. Henry Cook has issued a third edition of a little book on *What Baptists Stand For* (Carey Kingsgate Press ; 10s. 6d. net). That this work, which was first published in 1947, has reached a third edition is evidence that it has met a need; that it now appears in revised form is not evidence that Baptists have changed their positions, or that the author has changed his principles, but that the question of baptism has been widely discussed in recent years. A new appendix reviews some of those discussions.

The book as a whole is not limited to Baptist

views on the sacrament of baptism, however, but covers the views on Scripture, the Church, and Liberty, which are held among Baptists. While there is a substantial unity amongst the twenty million Baptists of the world, the author does not attempt to give a specious impression of uniformity by concealing the diversity of thought and practice that may be found among them. Liberty is one of the most cherished principles among them, and there is much diversity even amongst the British Baptists. Dr. Cook writes forcefully and attractively, with courtesy and charity towards those of his own communion and of others who would not in all things agree with him. He has had wide contacts with Baptists of every variety, and is a man of scholarly outlook and extensive reading and his account of Baptist faith and practice may be commended to those who do not share that faith and practice no less than to those who do.

H. H. Rowley

CALVIN

Calvin's commentaries in the edition of the Calvin Translation Society extend to some forty-five volumes. The difficulties of an editor in preparing one volume that would adequately represent this important part of the Reformer's writings will therefore be readily realized. Professor J. Haroutunian in ' The Library of Christian Classics ' (S.C.M. ; 35s. net) professes to have been guided by no single principle of selection but to have had several aims in view. His chief purpose was to provide his readers with good specimens of Calvin's exegetical qualities, but he was also interested in showing Calvin's concern with literary and historical questions, his understanding of the Bible ' as the Word of God and as a human document ', and his preoccupation with the upbuilding of the Church. To fulfil these ends he wisely decided to provide a fresh translation and not to depend upon that made about a hundred years ago for the Calvin Translation Society. In the resultant volume—*Calvin : Commentaries*—he has undoubtedly been successful. His book can be highly recommended to all who wish to be introduced to this part of Calvin's literary activity. Passages are taken from almost all the Commentaries and grouped together under various heads, such as The Bible, The Knowledge of God, The Christian Life, Faith, Providence, Election and Predestination, and The Church. Not all the passages fit neatly into the section allotted to them and there is overlapping, probably unavoidable. It will, however, be regretted by many that there is no section on the sacraments and that that distinctive part of Calvin's teaching is ignored. In addition to the passages from the Commentaries, three important extracts have been printed : the significant autobiographical sketch prefaced to the Commentary on the Psalms, containing Calvin's account of his conversion to Protestantism ; the Preface to Olivétan's French New Testament and the most interesting Epistle to Simon Grynaeus in which he sets out his purpose in publishing a Commentary on Romans when so many are available. Many readers will welcome the editor's general introduction in which he pleads so convincingly for a historical approach to the understanding of Calvin's theological position, particularly in regard to the doctrines of Providence, Election and Predestination. Indeed, were this approach more generally followed, less severely critical judgments would be passed on Calvin's theology and a deeper and more appreciative understanding of the man and his work obtained.

James K. Cameron

PERSONALISM

This book—*Person and Reality*, by Professor E. S. Brightman (Ronald Press, New York ; $6.50)—strongly advocating the claims of personality in the interpretation of the universe and fulfilling the author's endeavour to prove himself a ' constructive metaphysician ', has been produced under difficulties, as the writer died before its completion. It has, however, been ably edited by his successor in the Boston Chair, assisted by colleagues and friends. The editor, Professor Bertocci, contributes a concluding chapter—perhaps hardly necessary—by way of summary.

Professor Brightman's main argument is the interpretative usefulness of Personalism and he is in vigorous opposition to certain recent trends such as Absolute Idealism, Scientific Materialism, Scepticism, and Humanism, holding that all these tendencies deal with only a part of our experience and are not sufficiently ' holistic '. His positive belief is in the response everywhere in the objective world to the uninhibited searching of the exploring person. Over and over again he asks pertinently how there could be communication between us and the world unless reality had a foundation in a cosmic Experience. He does not place much reliance upon the contribution of sub-human nature, but he thinks that this is part of the operation of a personal God who is struggling towards the redemptive perfecting of mankind. Men are not simply parts of the Divine but are endowed with freedom. God is not absolute but is limited by the imperfections of humanity, of which limitations our author thinks the humanists are insufficiently aware. We cannot perceive and

dogmatically describe the ultimate form which the cosmic purpose will take, but sufficient assurance has been given of progress towards better conditions. His objection to scientific naturalism is that science has attended too exclusively to sense-data, and neglected the realm of values. His chapter on the Realm of Values is wholly beautiful, and he also gives an excellent treatment of the relation of Time to the concept of Eternity.

The style of the book is not particularly clear and there is a good deal of unnecessary repetition. The persistent repetition of the phrases 'the shining present' and the 'illuminating absent' becomes, for instance, a little irritating, but may be justified on the ground that the relation between these two aspects is his central problem. He holds finally that relativism and scepticism are metaphysically impossible, and that Absolutism with its emphasis on timelessness confuses our experience, seeing that 'all the evidence for God is in time'. We cannot make sense of anything in our experience unless we believe in a personal God supporting with unwearied persistence the courageous efforts of a free humanity.

W. S. URQUHART

APOCALYPTIC

It is a tribute to the critical acumen and penetrating insight of Dr. Adam C. Welch that a reprint rather than a new edition of his *Visions of the End* (James Clarke; 12s. 6d. net) should be issued after thirty-six years and read as freshly as a new book. In a Foreword, which alludes to the large amount of more modern work upon Apocalyptic, Dr. Porteous has no warning to give about any specific points on which Dr. Welch's views are superseded.

At one place Dr. Welch speaks of the singular outburst of Apocalyptic between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100. But as he himself goes on to emphasize, these limits embrace three centuries, as long as from the Reformation to Queen Victoria. What we have to think of is not a period of Apocalyptic as we think of the age of Pericles, or the Renascence, or the Victorian era, but of long centuries of change throughout which Apocalypse kept welling up as the popular expression of pious faith. Jesus Himself made use of apocalyptic language. Dr. Welch's book expounds its vital and enduring significance.

R. W. STEWART

The New Humanity, by Mr. Bruce Kenrick (Collins; 12s. 6d. net), is a literally extraordinary book. It is a book about the Church and is in two sections. The first section deals with the nature of the Church; and the second section deals with the consequences of the nature of the Church. The Church is the Body of Christ. Seldom has this phrase been taken with such almost fantastic literalness. The Church is the Church 'whose nature is identical with His nature'. 'His life is our life, His attributes are our attributes, His mission is our mission.' Mr. Kenrick goes the length of saying that 'when the judgment of God fell on His Son—we were there in His body on the tree'. Mr. Kenrick then goes on to adjust the balance by insisting with equal vehemence that Christ is the Head of the Church. And then goes on to define the Church's task.

There can be no doubt as to the glaring faults of this book. It makes statements to which it is almost impossible to attach any definite meaning. What meaning can any one attach to the statement that the attributes of Christ are the attributes of the Church? It is quite uncritical in its use of New Testament material, and it selects that material very much to suit itself. It would be the easiest thing in the world to find fault after fault with this book. And yet that is not the end of the story. There can be no doubt as to the merits of this book. It has a blazing enthusiasm and an inexhaustible vitality and a radiant sense of the magnificence of Jesus Christ and the glory of the Church. Even when at times we are moved to disagreement, it is a bracing experience to read it. There is an appreciative Foreword by Dr. James S. Stewart. One puts the book down with the feeling that its very faults are the results of the virtues which will enable its author one day to write a book which will be a far better book, if only he will ask himself constantly what he means by his statements.

The modern preacher has no lack of advisers; books about preaching are so plentiful that it seems questionable whether anything of importance can possibly have been left unsaid. Yet it is difficult to dismiss as superfluous any testimony which is born out of experience and deep conviction and sound common-sense, and so much at any rate can be said of the Bishop of Bradford's little book, *Stewards of Grace* (Hodder and Stoughton; 10s. 6d.). Most of the subjects dealt with have often been dealt with before—the preacher as artist, as trustee, as interpreter, as man of God—but Dr. Coggan treats them afresh with a conviction and an enthusiasm which are difficult to resist. So many topics are touched upon within a very narrow compass that no single one can be treated very thoroughly, and in fact the book as a whole has something of the character of a scrapbook. But it is an interesting and stimulating scrapbook. Perhaps the most valuable chapter is that entitled

'Preaching as Corporate Worship', which might give many a reader an entirely new insight into what is, or ought to be, involved in the preaching of the Word. The introductory chapter, too, is very bracing; to any preacher beginning to be worn down by the oft-repeated suggestion that 'the day of preaching is over', Dr. Coggan's robust rejoinder would bring encouragement and challenge. Let it be added that, in one or two of the later chapters, there is succour for the hard-pressed in the shape of suggestions, and even outlines, for quite a number of sermons.

The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order 1658 has been edited by Mr. A. G. Matthews and published at 9s. net by the Independent Press. The editor's historical introduction brings forward some new points and is all that could be desired, while the Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins has added a short note on the theology of the Declaration. A relic of the greatest age of English Congregational history, the Declaration leans heavily in its doctrinal sections on the Westminster Confession of Faith; and a useful feature of this edition is the difference of type which enables the reader to distinguish at a glance the portions of the Declaration which are taken from the Westminster Confession from the additions made at the Savoy, while the footnotes show the parts of the Confession omitted in the Declaration.

A Modern Approach to Marriage Counselling, by W. L. Herbert and F. V. Jarvis (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), is an excellent volume from which not merely marriage counsellors but ministers, social workers and even psychiatrists will derive great profit. The writers are experienced Probation Officers; and the volume, although every chapter shows an implicit knowledge of modern psychology, has come out of their own wide experience. If I remember rightly, Freud is mentioned once, but there is never a quotation. The writers know how to look 'below the surface' for the causes of marriage difficulties; and they know how to guard the counsellor against his own prejudices and immaturity. There are interesting chapters on the 'interview' which should be very helpful both to beginners and 'old hands'. Various 'cases' are used to illustrate the principles; and one chapter on 'Counsellor in Action' goes into great detail in one marriage failure. The book is entirely free from psycho-analytic jargon; is written in a free style; and could be the basis of a series of lectures to candidates for the ministry or social workers. It is one of the best for its purpose we have come across.

Atlas of the Early Christian World (Nelson; 70s. net) is translated into English and edited by Mary F. Hedlund, M.A., and Professor H. H. Rowley, M.A., B.Litt., D.D., LL.D., F.B.A., from the work of Professor F. van der Meer and Christine Mohrmann.

This is a truly magnificent volume which is far more than merely an atlas. It has forty-two six-colour maps. It has the normal geographical maps; but it has also maps showing, for example, the *habitat* of the early Christian writers in each century, of the location of early Christian monuments, of the Christian dioceses in various areas, and even of the route of Egeria's pilgrimage to the holy places. In addition to these maps it has six hundred and twenty gravure plates illustrating all Christian life in the early centuries.

Its main sections are The Church of the Martyrs A.D. 30–313; The Church of the Empire A.D. 313–600; The Fathers of the Church and Early Christian Literature. The accompanying text is excellent and an outstanding feature of it is the collection and verbatim citation of the evidence of the patristic writers on each section.

This is an expensive book, but it is worth every penny of its price. Simply as a printing production, it is outstanding. As a work of sheer erudition it has no real parallel. The photographs make it a real work of art. It is extraordinarily well indexed, and reference to any name or subject is exceptionally easy.

This is not the kind of book whose excellencies can be illustrated by quotations in a review; all that we can do is to describe its contents; but it is safe to say that it will be indispensable for students of the Early Church. It would be of immense value if the publishers could see their way to issue its maps as wall maps. This book is a library in itself, combined with an art gallery and an archaeological museum. Every student and teacher must be grateful for it.

It is desirable that from time to time the question of Christian unity, involving theology, practical attitudes, reunion schemes and negotiations, successes achieved and difficulties remaining, should be surveyed for the information of the general reader. An admirably comprehensive and yet fair and lucid attempt to do this in short compass has been made as a sequel to the Lambeth Conference—*Towards the Centre*, by Sir Charles Jeffries (S.P.C.K.; 4s. 6d. net). Sir Charles sees hopeful contemporary signs in the increasing stress on the Sacraments in the Protestant churches and on the Scriptures in the Catholic churches. Whatever may appear on the surface, the undercurrents are flowing towards the centre and the centre is Christ. Appended are questions on each chapter and suggestions for more detailed study as well as a reprint of the 1920 Lambeth appeal to all Christian people.

The Authorship of Philippians ii. 6-11

By the Reverend J. M. Furness, B.D., Walsall

The exegesis of this important Christological passage has always engaged the attention of scholars, and in recent times, especially since the publication of Lohmeyer's commentary in 1928, the authorship of the section has been widely discussed. While the balance of opinion is now, perhaps, generally against Pauline authorship, the issue is not by any means settled, and it may be useful to attempt a brief summary of the present state of the discussion.

So far as manuscript evidence is concerned, there is no reason to detach Ph 2^{6-11} from the rest of the Epistle, and in the Early Church the passage was accepted as an integral part of the whole. In modern times, however, there is a tendency to regard these verses as a pre-Pauline 'hymn to Christ', of which the Apostle has made use. Indeed, P. Bonnard [1] goes so far as to say: 'the integral Pauline authorship of these verses does not seem to us defensible'. Cullmann [2] is equally definite: 'One of the first confessions of faith composed for the worship of the primitive community is without doubt the text cited by Paul (Ph 2^{6-11}), which has rightly been called a Christian psalm. Paul is not its author; he has only taken it over from the community. It is a hymn, a confession of Christ in rhythmic form, whose original is probably Aramaic.' Barnikol [3] regarded the verses as a later addition of Marcionite origin artificially grafted into the Epistle. Against this, it may be pointed out that the 'Letter of the Churches of Gaul',[4] of which Irenaeus may well have been the redactor, contains what is, surely, a clear citation of our text: 'They were also so zealous in their imitation of Christ,—" who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God ", that though they had attained such honour (ὥστε ἐν τοιαύτῃ δόξῃ ὑπάρχοντες), and had borne witness, not once or twice, but many times . . . yet they did not proclaim themselves martyrs, nor did they suffer us to address them by this name. . . . They humbled themselves under the mighty hand by which they are now greatly exalted.' Quite apart from any theological considerations which may lead one to doubt if Ph $2^{6ff.}$ represents Marcionite teaching at all, the early reference in the Martyrs' letter constitutes a grave objection to Barnikol's view. Lohmeyer found in the text traces of familiar Iranian ideas vigorously reinforced with Jewish motifs, notably that of the Servant of Yahweh (Is 53). He considered that the author was a Jew who wrote in Greek.[5] Héring [6] saw here a Jewish-Christian hymn originating in the first church communities of Damascus or Antioch. Others, for example Cerfaux,[7] consider that the verses represent a Pauline fragment at first independent of the Epistle and later included by the Apostle himself. A similar view is held by Stauffer [8]: 'The passage . . . is neither pre-Pauline [Lohmeyer], since it is one of the characteristically Pauline incarnational formulae, while passion formulae are characteristic of the pre-Pauline period, nor post-Pauline [Barnikol], for it is found worked into Ro $10^{6ff.}$, but a credal hymn, which Paul composed at an earlier date and quotes here'. Michael [9] says only: 'It is not impossible that Paul is making use of the words of some early poem or hymn', while Taylor [10] considers: 'It may well be that the " hymn " is pre-Pauline'.[11]

The considerations which have led some scholars to doubt the Pauline authenticity of the passage are four in number:—

(1) *Vocabulary.* Three words, ἁρπαγμός, ὑπερυψοῦν, and καταχθόνιος do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, and the first of these is extremely rare in profane Greek. Μορφή is elsewhere used once only in the New Testament, at Mk 16^{12}. Paul uses κενοῦν four times elsewhere in his writings, but always in the sense 'make void', which cannot be its meaning here. Taylor [12] observes: 'The argument from *hapax legomena*

[1] *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians*, 48.

[2] *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 22. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 18.

[3] *Der Marconitische Ursprung des Mythossatzes Phil.*, ii. 6–7 [1932].

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, V. ii. 2.

[5] *Kyrios Jesus*, 8 ff.

[6] 'Kyrios Anthropos' (Ph 2^{6-11}), in *Rev. d'Hist. Phil. Relig.*, xvi. [1936] 196–209.

[7] *Le Christ dans la Theologie de Saint Paul*, 122.

[8] *New Testament Theology*, 284, n. 372.

[9] *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary: Philippians*, 83.

[10] V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, 63.

[11] M. Dibelius, R. Bultmann, A. M. Hunter, J. Jeremias, and W. K. L. Clarke are other scholars who regard the passage as pre-Pauline.

[12] *Op. cit.*, 63.

does not carry us far, for there are other passages in the Pauline Epistles of equal length in which as many words of the kind can be found '. One might instance the elegant ' hymn of love ' in 1 Co 13 which, to a cursory examination, reveals three words[1] which do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament (including one which is extremely rare in secular Greek), and three which occur elsewhere in the New Testament only in non-Pauline texts.[2] In any case, it should be borne in mind that this is poetry (or at the very least, rhetorical prose), in which we normally expect to find the unusual word or phrase used for heightened effect.

(2) *Context.* It is suggested that the ' hymn ' in *vv.* 6–11 breaks the flow of the parænesis : Hunter[3] describes it as ' " a purple patch " stitched into the fabric of the exhortation '. Further, the exhortation in Ph 2^{1-5} appears to have been adapted in content to the verses of the ' hymn ' which follow.[4] It may be replied that there is a fundamental unity of theme in the Epistle; chs. 1 and 2 appear to read smoothly, the οὖν of 2^{1} forming a connexion with 1^{27}[5] after a typical Pauline digression, and Paul's appeal to his readers, based on four grounds, two objective (his appeal to the example of Christ in our passage, and the entreaty to Euodia and Syntyche in 4^{2}) and two subjective (the admonition to do all things without murmurings and disputings in 2^{14}, and an exhortation to moderation and forebearance in 4^{5}) runs through the whole letter. As Vincent points out, the appeal is ' not to what was demanded by the readers' personal relations to Paul . . . it is the Christian experience of the Philippians that is appealed to '. In such an appeal, the moving Christological passage finds a natural, and indeed a necessary place. Further, it may be argued that an appeal to the example of Christ (cf. Ro 15^{3}, 2 Co 8^{9}) is characteristically Pauline. It is tempting to suggest that ' If I am poured out ' (*v.* 17)[6] may indicate that the idea of pouring oneself out in entire self-giving (perhaps inspired by Is 53^{12}) was much to the fore in Paul's mind as he wrote, and that the whole passage is really a vigorous expression of what had become for the Apostle, in his later years, something of a ' magnificent obsession '.[7] If this is so, we may find here an unconscious link with the ἐκένωσε of *v.* 7.

(3) *Rhythmic structure.* The careful style and formal rhythmic structure of the passage was noted by Moffatt in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, where Ph 2^{6-11} is set out in the form of two stanzas of four lines each.[8] A more detailed study of the structure of the verses was undertaken by Lohmeyer in 1928, who found here a carefully composed ' hymn ' of six three-line strophes,[9] the words θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ being excluded from the analysis as a Pauline gloss :

I. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο
τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ

II. ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε
μορφὴν δούλου λαβών
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος

III. καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος
ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν
γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου

(θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ)

IV. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε
καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα
τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα

V. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ
καταχθονίων

VI. καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται
ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός.

It will be noticed that this arrangement preserves the usual verse divisions.[10] Lohmeyer's scheme has been widely adopted by scholars. W. K. L. Clarke[11] has shown that the hymn ' possesses the 3 : 3 : 3

[1] ἁλαλάζον ; χρηστεύομαι ; περπερεύομαι.

[2] χαλκός ; παροξύνω ; ἔσοπτρον.

[3] A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, 48.

[4] κενοδοξίαν ; ταπεινοφροσύνη ; ἡγούμενοι of *v.* 3, for instance, form a striking link with *vv.* 6–11.

[5] So Vincent, *I.C.C.: Philippians*, 53. For another able defence of the unity of theme of the Epistle, see Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, 283 f.

[6] εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι : the verb σπένδω was in Homer always religious, meaning to ' pour out a libation ', but in later writers, *e.g.* Plato, *Legg.*, 799B, it means simply ' to pour '—so Liddell and Scott. The only other New Testament occurrence of the verb is in 2 Ti 4^{6}, a passage which is usually regarded as genuinely Pauline.

[7] Rev. D. R. Griffiths suggests a possible parallel in Ignatius, who seems to have been more seriously obsessed with the idea of martyrdom.

[8] 2nd Ed., p. 167.

[9] Set out by Hunter, *op. cit.*, 46.

[10] Cerfaux (*op. cit.*, 288) arranges the passage in three stanzas of four, five and six lines respectively and (*ib.*, 283, N. 9) J. Jeremias is quoted as favouring an arrangement of three four-line strophes obtained by deleting three phrases as Pauline glosses : θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ ; ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων ; εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.

[11] *New Testament Problems*, 146 f.

metre, exceptional in the Old Testament, but apparently favoured in the Early Church: Eph 5^{14}, 1 Ti 3^{16}, Lk 2^{29-32} are cited as further examples. Clarke concludes that this passage and the *Nunc Dimittis* were both originally composed in Aramaic and speedily translated for use by Greek-speaking congregations. In support of this contention, Clarke appends a transliteration of the verses into Galilean Aramaic by P. P. Levertoff, who finds that strophes 1 to 4 are in hymn form, while 5 and 6 are 'obviously St. Paul's own application of Isaiah 43.23 to Jesus'.

That the verses are poetry or poetically exalted prose is not disputed, but the fact does not necessarily tell against Pauline authorship. Taylor has pointed out [1] that other Pauline passages, for example, 1 Co 1^{26-31} and 2 Co 11^{21-29}, have similar characteristics.[2] One might add 1 Co 15, a lyrical passage containing some striking parallelism, especially in *vv.* 21–22, and followed immediately by the 'And now concerning the collection' of 16^{1}. The 'hymn' of Ph 2, linked, as it is, with a relatively mundane appeal to humility, seems to be altogether in the Pauline manner. That Paul had fine literary gifts none would deny, and in the leisurely composition of the Captivity Epistles they would find their full and natural expression. Colossians 1^{15-20} is another fine passage in which *hapax legomena* and liturgical style have led some scholars to deny Pauline authorship. Ephesians in greater degree, shows a vocabulary and style unfamiliar in Paul's earlier writings. May it not be that the development of the Apostle's thought (and style) in later years, and the influence on both of his prolonged captivity, unaccustomed leisure providing greater opportunities for careful composition, account for these differences? [3]

(4) *Theological.* What Taylor [4] calls 'the strongest argument' against the Pauline authorship of our passage is the suggestion by Lohmeyer and Bonnard that the 'Servant' theology of Ph 2^{6-11} is pre-Pauline. Bonnard says: 'We can understand the Christologies of Paul and of the Fourth Evangelist as developments of these verses, but certainly not as formulations preparatory to those of the hymn. After the Pauline epistles and the Johannine writings, our verses would have difficulty in finding their place in the development of primitive Christology.' [5] Taylor [6] has shown that Paul makes little use of the Servant conception in his theological expression, and Hunter [7] considers that our passage lacks characteristic Pauline ideas, especially the Resurrection, which he regards as determinative for St. Paul. On the other hand, many scholars have found in this passage a definite allusion to Adam.[8] The negative cast of the sentence—'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize [R.V.] [A.V.: 'thought it not robbery'] to be on an equality with God'—is certainly surprising unless the writer intended to point a contrast with some individual who *did* count it a prize to be equal with God, or who did see in the form of God a means of self-enrichment, and most likely the individual of whom the writer was thinking was Adam. Now the Last Adam motif [9] is characteristic of St. Paul who, alone of New Testament writers, uses it, so that we can balance against the (for Paul) unfamiliar Servant conception, the very familiar Adam motif, and this, surely, makes it more difficult to deny that the Apostle may have composed these lines, whether at the time of writing to Philippi or at some earlier date.

The theological argument is radical and basic and can be established only by a full appraisal of Pauline Christological thought in general, a question upon which, as the quotations from Stauffer and Hunter (above) indicate, the opinion of scholars is very divided. But in any case, the issue is really only of academic importance, for whether the 'hymn' was written by the Apostle or not, he certainly uses it here to express his own beliefs about the Person of Christ.[10]

Conclusions. The foregoing discussion has indicated that arguments against the Pauline

[1] *Op. cit.*, 63.

[2] Rev. D. R. Griffiths suggests in a private communication that Ro 8^{35-39} is another example of a Pauline passage which is poetic, if not exactly rhythmic. Similar views have been expressed by Zahn (in his *Introduction to the New Testament*), G. R. Cragg and C. K. Barrett.

[3] This argument is necessary only on the traditional dating of the Captivity Epistles (Rome, A.D. 62–64). If, with Duncan *et al.* they are dated from Ephesus (A.D. 53–55), *i.e.*, roughly contemporary with 1 and 2 Co, no development in Paul's thought and style need be urged, and we shall conclude that the Apostle's style at an earlier date was more rich and varied than is sometimes supposed.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 63.

[5] *Op. cit.*, 48.

[6] *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, 65 f.

[7] *Op. cit.*, 48.

[8] Cf. Rawlinson, *New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, 134; Richardson, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 15; F. C. Synge, *Philippians and Colossians* [The Torch Bible Commentaries], 29.

[9] The Last Adam doctrine is found in Ro 5^{12-21}, 1 Co $15^{22.\,45-49}$.

[10] Some scholars, *e.g.*, Wheeler Robinson (*The Cross in the Old Testament*, 105) and J. Jeremias (*The Servant of God*, N. 445), interpret the *kenosis* as that of the Crucifixion, not the Incarnation, in which case the 'hymn' will express Paul's beliefs about the work of Christ.

authenticity of Ph 2^{6-11}, based upon considerations of vocabulary, context and poetic form, cannot be said to be conclusive or even really convincing. The theological argument may fairly be said to be still *sub judice*, and there appears to be a case for a careful re-examination of the whole question.

Nevertheless, one's general conclusion from the state of the evidence endorses the conclusion of E. F. Scott: 'We cannot but observe the absolute fitness of the passage to its context. It has not been dragged in, but rises naturally out of what has been said before and prepares the way for all that follows. . . . It may be doubted whether any other teacher has yet arrived at this conception of the work of Christ . . . and a passage which expresses so grandly the conviction of Paul may safely be ascribed to Paul himself.'[1]

[1] *The Interpreter's Bible*, xi. 47.

Great Themes of the New Testament

IV. Acts ii. 14–40 (*continued*)

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

We have seen that this first Christian sermon begins with the joyful announcement that something has happened, that eternity has broken into time, that the end time has come, and that the great prophetic promises have been fulfilled. There follows an equally emphatic announcement, the announcement that this has happened through the life, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus. To many the supreme interest of this passage will lie in its Christology, for here is the Christology, not of men who thought about Jesus as a theological figure, but who had never seen Him, but of men who had known Him, walked with Him, talked with Him in the days of His flesh, of men who had seen His life, who had watched Him die, and who had met Him when He rose again.

Peter describes Jesus in the most startling way. 'Jesus of Nazareth,' he says, 'a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you' (*v.* 22). The extraordinary feature of this description of Jesus is its heaping up of human terms. The name is Jesus, not Jesus Christ, not the Lord Jesus, simply Jesus. He is localized as coming from Nazareth, a definite and identifiable Galilean place. He is bluntly and uncompromisingly called a man (ἄνδρα). He is *approved* by God. Here there is a variant reading which is of the greatest interest and significance. The reading of the Neutral Text, and of all the best manuscripts, with one exception, is ἀποδεδειγμένον, which is reflected in Tertullian's *destinatum* (Tertullian, *Pud.*, xxi.; cf. *Res. Carn.*, xv.). But the reading of the Western Text is δεδοκιμασμένον, which is reflected in Irenaeus' *adprobatum* (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III. xii. 2), and in certain old Latin manuscripts. Let us inquire into the meaning of these two very important words.

First, let us look at the verb ἀποδείκνυμι. At its simplest it can be used of pointing at something in order to direct attention to it. Thucydides used it for *pointing* at the sepulchres of common ancestors (Thucydides, i. 26). It can be used of bringing forward proofs that something is true (Herodotus, v. 45). It can be used of appointing or assigning an altar to a divinity (Herodotus, v. 178). It can be used of advancing an argument (Thucydides, ii. 72), or of demonstrating by argument that some one is something. Euripides, for instance, uses it of demonstrating that some one is a traitor (Euripides, *Ion*, 879).

When it is used more directly of persons it can mean to appoint, to proclaim, or to create. It can be used of appointing a commander (Herodotus, i. 124); a general (Herodotus, i. 162); a captain of the horse (Herodotus, vii. 154). It can be used of putting some one into a certain condition, for instance, of an officer producing such conditions of discipline and service that he puts his platoon of soldiers into the best possible condition (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, II. i. 23). It can be used of representing some one as something (Herodotus, i. 136). It can be used of ordaining a person to a certain state. Xenophon says that the Spartan law-giver ordained that the coward who did not keep the code should no longer be reckoned amongst the peers (Xenophon, *Constit. Lac.*, x. 7).

Moulton and Milligan cite the following uses of it. It is used of nominating an heir to an estate, of appointing supervisors, of establishing a title to ownership. And it can be used of appointing a person as Emperor. It is said on the accession of

Nero to the imperial power : ' The expectation and hope of the world has been declared emperor.' Ὕπατος ἀποδεδειγμένος is the regular phrase for consul designate.

In general, then, the word means to appoint, to designate to an office.

Let us now look at δοκιμάζω, the word of the variant reading of the Western Text. It can mean ' to put to the test '. Thucydides uses it for testing the reliability of witnesses (Thucydides, vi. 53), and Xenophon uses it of testing the reality of a man's friendship (Xenophon, *Mem.*, II. vi. 1). It can be used of that which is approved and attested by usage, custom and experience as contrasted with that which is novel and untried (Thucydides, ii. 35). It is commonly used of approving some one for an office after due scrutiny and examination. Plato uses it of the scrutiny of State officials prior to their appointment to office (Plato, *Laws*, 765 B) ; Aristotle uses it for the scrutiny of the qualifications of councillors (Aristotle, *Constit. Ath.*, xlv. 3). It is used of passing a cavalryman as fit for service (Xenophon, *Anab.*, III. iii. 20), and Aristotle uses it of the admission of boys to the ranks of the *ephebi* (the youths of eighteen to twenty years of age who did national service in Athens), and of the admission of the *ephebi* to the status of manhood (Aristotle, *Constit. Ath.*, xlii. 2).

Moulton and Milligan show from the papyri that the word comes to be a technical term for passing the tests necessary for any office. It is used of a magistrate sifting evidence ; of inspecting animals for sacrifice ; of arbitrators appointed to settle some dispute and approved by both parties to the dispute. It is used of a physician who has passed his examination, who has stood the test of his knowledge of medical technique and who is approved in character.

It may be said that both words amount to very much the same thing, but that δεδοκιμασμένος sharpens and accentuates the idea that is in ἀποδεδειγμένος. They both mean ' to appoint ', ' to designate ' to some office, especially after all the necessary tests and scrutiny.

The startling thing about this is that this is something very like that which later came to be known as an Adoptionist Christology, which held that Jesus was a man who was specially chosen, adopted, by God for His special purposes, because He had proved Himself worthy of such a choice. If it be asked when that choice and adoption took place, the commonest and the simplest answer would be at His baptism. In Lk 3^{22} we again meet with an interesting and significant variant reading. The verse gives us the words of the Divine voice at the baptism of Jesus. The consistent reading of the Neutral Text is : ' Thou art my beloved Son ; in thee I am well pleased.' But the Western Text, and there is support from Justin, Clement, Methodius, Ambrosiaster, Tyconius and Augustine, reads : ' Thou art my beloved Son ; this day have I begotten thee ', which is in fact a quotation from Ps 2^{7}, and which again has an Adoptionist tinge and colouring.

The difficulty of this phrase for orthodoxy is seen in the many translations of it. Lake and Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity* translate *appointed* ; Moffatt and Weymouth have *accredited* ; Kingsley Williams has *proclaimed* ; Phillips has *proved to be* ; A.R.S.V. has *attested*. The fact is that here we have the most primitive of all Christologies, and that Christology is Adoptionist. No one is going to deny that as the years went on and as men's minds wrestled with the problem of the Person of Christ that Christology was left far behind ; and no one is going to claim that Adoptionism is an adequate explanation of Jesus Christ ; but, before we anathematize such a Christology, it is well to remember that it has its place in the New Testament, and that it came first to the minds of at least some of those who had known Jesus in the days of His flesh.

Next, we must look at what Peter's sermon has to say about the death of Jesus. This is summed up in *v.* 23 : ' This Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men ' (A.R.S.V.). There is in this verse the characteristic outlook of Acts on the death of Christ. Here, and all through the Book of Acts two convictions about the death of Jesus are joined together.

(*a*) It is unvaryingly held that the death of Jesus was part of the purpose and the plan of God. It was in ' the definite plan and foreknowledge of God '. God showed beforehand by the mouth of the prophets all that Christ should suffer, and these things have now been fulfilled (3^{18}). The Jews and Romans rose up to do against Christ ' whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done ' (4^{28}). It was, says Paul, when they had fulfilled ' what was written of Christ ' that they took Him down from the tree (13^{29}). Acts is convinced that the sufferings and the death of Christ were part of the plan and the purpose of God. There is nothing of the idea that the Cross was a kind of emergency action which God had taken only when everything else had failed and gone wrong. There is no suggestion that things, so to speak, had got out of control. There is not the slightest tinge of any opposition between Jesus Christ and God, no hint of that kind of theology in which it may almost be said that a gentle and loving Jesus pacified a stern and angry God. The Cross was part of the eternal plan of God.

(*b*) But side by side with that in this passage, and everywhere in its thinking, Acts sees the Cross

as the most terrible crime in history. The early preachers could not speak of the Cross without a shuddering thrill of horror in their voices. 'Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life' (3^{14}). 'Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified,' 'Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree' (4^{10} 5^{30})—the words are simple, but they are instinct with the feeling that here is a terrible and a tragic crime at the hands of men.

Here is the eternal paradox of the Cross; the Cross is at one and the same time the action of the purpose and the plan of the love of God, and an unspeakably terrible crime at the hands of wicked men. At first sight herein is a paradox and a contradiction. But it is the paradox which lies at the very heart of the human situation, because it sets side by side the Divine will of God and the mystery of the free will of man. The Cross must always remain at one and the same time the act of God's love and the crime of man's sin.

Next Peter goes on to affirm the Resurrection, and it is of the greatest significance that Peter spends more time (*vv.* 24–31) on the Resurrection than on anything else. Acts is characteristically the Gospel of the Risen Christ. Once again the Resurrection is guaranteed by the citation of prophecy; Ps 16^{8-11} is worked out as a foretelling of the Resurrection. For the disciples themselves the Resurrection was 'the star in the firmament of Christianity'. It was to it they owed their faith. The Cross had left them broken and bewildered; it was the Resurrection which gave them their faith. We have only to think of Peter before and after the Resurrection. In the time of the Cross his faith collapsed, fear conquered him, and he denied his Lord. After the Resurrection this self-same Peter courageously defied the same Sanhedrin which had sent his Lord to the Cross, and which could send him to a like fate. Every effect must have an adequate cause; and nothing but the Resurrection can explain the astonishing change in the disciples.

But the most characteristic thought of Acts about the Resurrection is that the Resurrection is the work of God. 'Whom God hath raised up', says Peter. 'This Jesus hath God raised up' (*vv.* 24, 32). This is the characteristic statement of Acts. You 'killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead' (3^{15}). 'Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead' (4^{10}).

It may be that sometimes the Resurrection is presented as a victory and a triumph of Jesus; it is not so in Acts; in Acts the Resurrection is an act of God.

In Acts, and, indeed, in all New Testament thought, God is behind everything. There is no danger of tritheism. There is no danger of what H. Richard Niebuhr called 'Christism' (*The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry*, 44–47). The lonely supremacy of God remains. The writers of the New Testament were Jews, and were, therefore, uncompromisingly monotheistic. The Resurrection is not the achievement even of Jesus Christ; it is the Divine act of the power of God.

So Peter's thought about Jesus rises to its natural conclusion and culmination. The outcome of Jesus' life, the outcome of His death, and the outcome of His Resurrection is His exaltation (*v.* 33). Once again this is guaranteed by the appeal to prophecy, and the citation of Ps 110^{1}. And it is this exaltation which gives Jesus Christ the right to make His unparalleled demands and to offer His unparalleled promises. It is this which proves Him to be both Lord and Christ (*v.* 36). It is this which demonstrates Him to be the promised and the awaited Messiah.

Once Peter has confronted his hearers with the fact of Jesus Christ and His Messiahship, and once his words have moved their hearts, he goes on to make two demands and offer two promises.

(1) He demands that they should *repent*. The Greek word for repentance is *μετανοία*, and it is a word of the greatest interest. *Μετανοία* literally means an *afterthought* as opposed to *προνοία* which means *forethought*. An afterthought, a second thought, is usually a changed thought. That is to say, it is a realization and an admission that the previous way and the previous action were wrong. To realize that the previous way was wrong ought to result in regret and sorrow for it. And, if that regret and sorrow have any reality, they ought to issue in a new way and in amendment of life. In all real repentance there must, then, be three elements—the realization of the wrongness of the past, sorrow for that wrongness, and the decision to amend life in the future. If any of these elements is lacking, repentance is incomplete. We may say that repentance involves a change of mind, a change of heart, and a change of life. It is nothing less than that that Peter was demanding from his hearers—and that must still be the prophetic demand of the preacher.

(2) There is the demand for *baptism* as entrance into the Christian Church. With this demand a Jew would be perfectly familiar, for baptism was in fact the way in which proselytes entered the Jewish faith. Baptism, sacrifice, so long as the Temple stood, and circumcision were the three necessary preliminaries to entry into the Jewish faith. But it is necessary to realize what baptism was and meant and implied at this stage of the Church. In the nature of things at this stage in the history of the Church baptism was adult baptism, and was the step by which a man

professed his faith in Jesus Christ. Equally in the nature of things baptism was instructed baptism, and there were some in the Church who would have insisted that a man must undergo as much as seven years' instruction in the faith before he was baptized. Even in a passage like this, where baptism seems to follow almost immediately, those to be baptized still receive the word. Baptism, as indeed proselyte baptism was, was by real immersion, and it was by the sinking below the water and the rising from it again that unity with the death and the resurrection of Christ was symbolized—and more than symbolized. Finally, baptism was what might be called ethical baptism. It brought that to a man which enabled him to live a new life in which sin had no more power to lord it over him. The gateway to the Christian fellowship was the gateway of baptism.

(3) Having made the demands, Peter offers the promises. There is the offer of *forgiveness of sins*. The word for forgiveness is ἄφεσις, and the characteristic atmosphere of this word is *release*. It can describe all kinds of releases—the release of water to the fields when the Nile sluice-gates were opened; the release from debt and the remission of debt; the release from captivity; the release from some civic obligation which a citizen must perform. It is the freeing from a debt which a man cannot pay, and from an obligation which he cannot fulfil. What Peter was offering men through Jesus Christ was a new relationship with God in which a man no longer had the dreadful feeling of being in default and under condemnation for his failure in his duties and his obligations, a relationship in which the dread of God had become peace with God.

(4) Finally, the promise is the promise of the *Holy Spirit*. And in Acts the action of the Holy Spirit on the life of a man is such that all can see it (Ac 10^{46} 19^{6}). Acts is the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, and in its first thirteen chapters there are more than forty references to the Holy Spirit. That which Peter was offering through Jesus Christ was release from the past and power for the future combined.

After the demands and the promises there comes, as it were, one last word 'Save yourselves from this untoward generation' (*v.* 40). That is to say that the Christian message ended with a threat. It bluntly confronted a man with the alternative of being saved or of perishing. The early preachers did not hesitate to tell men what would happen, if the offer of Christ was not accepted.

In *Grace Abounding* John Bunyan tells of the Sunday on which he heard a sermon on the Sabbath. On that same afternoon, he goes on, 'as I was in the midst of a game of cat, and having struck it one blow from the hole, just as I was about to strike it the second time a voice did suddenly dart from heaven into my soul, which said, "Wilt thou leave thy sins and go to heaven, or have thy sins and go to hell?"' Here was the clear-cut alternative, and it was with that alternative that early preaching confronted its hearers.

Here, then, in this sermon of Peter, we have the main elements in early preaching, and we may now set them down that we may compare them with our own practice.

(1) First and foremost, it was the proclamation of an act of God, the announcement of the saving activity of God. It was not so much a debater's argument, however clever, as it was a witness's affirmation.

(2) It laid down the centrality of Jesus Christ in that action of God. It dealt with the life, the death, the resurrection, the exaltation and the Messiahship of Jesus, and its characteristic stress was even more on the Resurrection than it was on the Cross.

(3) It insisted that all history had pointed to Jesus Christ, and to the great events of His life. It laid particular stress and emphasis on the fulfilment of prophecy, and in so doing it witnessed to its belief in the purpose and the plan of God, and, therefore, in the purpose and the plan of history.

(4) It demanded repentance, and that repentance was not merely a comfortable, languishing, sentimental regret; it was not simply regret at the consequences and the results of sin; it was a complete change of mind, heart, and life, so complete a change that it could only be described in terms of a new man and a new life.

(5) It summoned to baptism as the gateway of entry into the Church, and the means of union with Christ, and washing from sin.

(6) It offered forgiveness for the past, remission of the debt and the obligation which a man had necessarily incurred to God; and, therefore, it offered a new relationship to God.

(7) It offered the gift of the Spirit through Jesus Christ, so that not only would the past be forgiven, but the future would be strengthened and renewed and directed.

(8) It uttered a stern warning of the consequence of neglecting this offer. To accept it is to be saved; to refuse it is to perish.

Such, then, was the pattern of the first preaching, and it is a pattern which is still the pattern to be copied.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Sugar for the Horse

By Rita Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Sometimes when I open my big London newspaper called *The Times* it seems too big. It is so full of big and important news that to read it all would take me all day, and I should not get any work done at all. And then it would be next morning—and there would be another copy of *The Times* waiting. So big and important is this famous London paper, so full of important people and important happenings—weddings and wars, and rich people's deaths, and pictures and plays, and travellers to far distant lands. Things have to be very important to a great many people to get into that great newspaper.

But one morning, as I was looking through *The Times*, I came across an exciting piece of news—right at the top of a column—that wasn't about a big and important person, or a rich person, or a traveller in a far distant land, but about a little boy and a horse.

It happened on Michael's first visit to London. Michael—whose other name is Bartlett—lives in a place called Wallington, down in Surrey, a good way from London. And on this visit to the great city with his father and mother, he chanced that cold icy morning to see a policeman's horse, named Dante, slip outside his stable in Great Scotland Yard. And though Dante managed to struggle up again on to his feet, without unseating his rider, it was a nasty thing to happen.

Little Michael saw it all happen—though it took only a second or two. And though Michael and his father and mother moved away, and the day was crammed with other sights, he couldn't get Dante out of his mind. At night, when he was safely tucked up in bed, he couldn't help wondering how Dante was feeling, and if he was hurt. He thought about him so much, and talked about him so much, that in the end his father promised to write a letter to New Scotland Yard, where the London policemen have their office, and ask about Dante.

And when the letter was written, Michael waited eagerly to see it go off in the post. But he didn't send the letter alone—' Michael added to the letter ', *The Times* said, ' a small box from his toy cupboard, full of sugar-lumps " to make the horse better ", and a bar of chocolate " for the kind rider ".'

Now a very official-looking letter has come for Michael—addressed to him from a Senior Metropolitan Police Official, telling him about Dante, and thanking him for his concern.

And it was such a surprising thing for such a very little boy to get such a big and important-looking letter that somebody told *The Times* editor. And although he had lots of news waiting to go into his paper—news of weddings and wars, and deaths of rich people, and pictures and plays, and travellers in far distant lands, he put this piece of news about little Michael into the very top of a column in his paper. He plainly hoped that lots of people would read it—and I, for one, did. And that just shows how wise that great editor is—for any little thing that is kind in this big world is big and important, and deserves a place in the newspaper.

I wonder if you know of the Beatitudes ? They are words of Jesus—part of His Sermon on the Mount—now in our New Testament (Mt 5^{1-12}). And each one begins with ' *Blessed* '—' *Blessed* are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy. *Blessed* are the pure in heart : for they shall see God '. They are a little hard for boys and girls ; but somebody has made some children's Beatitudes—and they are easy and lovely to understand. ' Blessed ' means ' Happy '—and each one begins with ' Happy '. And the very first one says—' *Happy are they who are kind to dumb creatures*, for they are the children of the Father who made all things '.

' Happy are they who laugh when they feel like crying, for they shall be called God's heroes.'

' Happy are they who forgive others quickly, for God's sunshine shall be upon their faces.'

' Happy are they who want very much to grow up wise and good, for God is their helper.'

In The Treetops

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff

' In honour preferring one another.'—Ro 12^{10}.

A few months ago an incident occurred which recalled a nursery rhyme that, I'm sure, you've all heard :

Pussy cat, pussy cat,
Where have you been ?
I've been up to London
To see the Queen.

What took place in this other incident, though, was in Kenya—you know where that is—not in London. Two baboons, it seems, scrambled up to the observation platform of the Treetops Hotel, a sort of Peter Pan house in the trees, to see the Queen Mother.

The Treetops Hotel is a very famous one. Seven years ago two other distinguished visitors stayed in it, Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh. It was when they were there the news arrived that King George VI was dead. About which a well-known author wrote: 'A young girl climbed into a tree one day a Princess, and climbed down from the tree next day a Queen'. Yes, Queen Elizabeth as she now is.

Now what do you think that Queen Elizabeth and the Queen Mother saw from up there? The Treetops Hotel overlooks a water-hole. At night the wild animals arrive to drink, any number of them, of different sorts and sizes too; rhinos, elephants, gazelles, zebras, giraffes and others, which is rather exciting.

One habit, however, of these wild animals is, I think, worth noting. No matter which of them gets to the water first, everyone gives way to the elephants. They, being biggest, are allowed the first turn. Then the rhinos get in, next the giraffes, after them the zebras, and then the rest of the small fry in any order.

Now, that may be all very well for animals, but it is apt to make trouble when men and nations act in that manner. It doesn't do for bigger peoples always to be pushing the smaller and weaker ones around. Surely they ought to show more unselfishness and allow these others a fair share, too.

Anyhow, that is exactly what St. Paul would have us to do: 'in honour preferring one another', or to follow, as he has also said 'the more excellent way'.

It is still wise advice, isn't it? Jungle ways make for war and strife. Jesus' way, for it was His as well as St. Paul's, though a deal more difficult, helps to make for friendship and peace.

The Christian Year

TRINITY SUNDAY

The Open Secret

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL FREDERIC GREEVES, M.A., DIDSBURY COLLEGE, WESTBURY-ON-TRYM

'Through him [Christ] we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.'—Eph 2^{18}.

Although Trinity Sunday was first celebrated, in Liège, in the tenth century, and only became universal in the fourteenth, it has rightly become the day towards which the whole Christian year leads. The journey that starts at Advent, and proceeds through Christmas, Easter and Whitsun, reaches its triumphant end on Trinity Sunday; the score and more of Sundays that follow are dated, 'after Trinity'. It is more than unfortunate if this journey's end is shrouded in mystery, and if what comes 'after' follows only a conundrum.

In one sense, of course, Trinity Sunday does celebrate what is mysterious in the sense of being beyond all human knowledge. What it means to *God Himself* to be Triune—'Three in One and One in Three'—is something that men can never understand. Attempts have been made, in ancient and in modern times, to help us towards such understanding, but I do not believe that any of them help us greatly. How could they? If God is Triune, He is certainly the only being who is; nothing else can be just like Him. To recognise where mystery (in this sense of the word) lies, is part of Christian duty; there is a place for agnosticism in all true Christian faith. If the last great festival of the Christian year led us to worship a God whose nature could be *fully* comprehended it would lead us to one who would be too small to be God.

In another sense of the word 'mystery', however, Trinity Sunday calls us to exult and rejoice in a mystery. The New Testament consistently uses the Greek word for 'mystery' to mean a secret that had long been only a secret, but which is now an *open* secret. Indeed, rather surprisingly, the New Testament means by 'mystery' almost what we mean by 'revelation'. So, to-day, we reach the last stage of the telling of the secret about God. That which we began to think about at Advent and Christmas, the secret that has been unfolding before us, is now declared; we worship the One God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

1. Let us remember, firstly, how this knowledge first came to men, how this secret was first disclosed. It began, we must never forget, among those whom God had been preparing for this very thing to happen; it began among the people of Israel who had learnt so much about God. One of the strangest statements that even Jesus ever made was made to such people, to Jews: 'No one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him'. Jesus, the Son of God, came to introduce all men, including the people of Israel, to His Father; that is the fact about which the whole Christian year up to Whitsunday has been reminding us afresh.

Whitsunday itself proclaimed to us that all that the Father had been doing through the Son became recognised by the apostles, and became a reality in their lives and in the lives of those who received

their message. From that time men and women knew what it meant to be brought to the Father, by the Son, through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if we ask the New Testament writers what is meant by ' being a Christian ', we receive one answer which differs greatly from the many varied answers now given to that question. We learn this answer from our text, as Jewish Christians remind Gentiles, who had not shared their Hebrew faith but who had become their fellow-Christians—' There is no barrier between us, because in Christ we both have access in one Spirit to the Father '. To be a Christian is to be living with the Father, in the Father's world, introduced by the Son and empowered by the Holy Spirit.

It is important to notice that this account of Christian living, of Christian experience, is taught consistently and repeatedly in the New Testament. We often hear it said that there is no doctrine of the Trinity in the Bible. That is obviously true if it means that the formulation of that doctrine in technical terms, such as we find in the Creeds, is not Scriptural ; but if the statement implies that the first Christians knew nothing (or little) about the Triune God, it is patently untrue. Dr. J. N. D. Kelly has drawn our attention to ' a host of passages ' in the New Testament which have what he calls a ' trinitarian pattern ', that is, in which the work of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is described. A writer, who is probably the greatest living expert in this field of study, has said that long before the doctrine of the Trinity was formulated, the Christians ' lived trinitarianly '.

As the formal doctrine of the Trinity was stated because ordinary Christians had for many years worshipped the Triune God and experienced His power, so to-day the Triune God may be known by all of us, whether or not it is our duty to study technical theological language. In so far as we are Christians at all, it is because of what God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit has done for us and in us. It is in *this* One God that all our hopes lie.

2. Trinity Sunday is, therefore, the day upon which the fullness of God is celebrated, upon which we specially rejoice in all that He means to man as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is, if I may so put it, the summing-up day of the Christian year. We must now notice more carefully that the message of this day is a message about the *One* God. In short, Trinity Sunday witnesses to the *unity* of God !

Those men of Israel who became the first Christians never, for a single moment, doubted the age-long certainty of Israel : ' The Lord is ONE '. As Christians, however, they knew how much more there is in that One-ness than anybody had previously imagined. That is a somewhat crude, but, I hope, not misleading way of describing what it meant for them to think and live ' trinitarianly '.

Many of us find some aid to thought about the Tri-unity of God by thinking that there is in God all the depth and richness of personal relationship, although a relationship so complete and unbroken that even the closest human love-relationship cannot enable us to imagine what God is like. But such speculation is an attempt to understand what it means to God Himself to be Triune—a task which, as I said earlier, we cannot hope to fulfil. It is immeasurably more important for us to concentrate to-day upon the truth that all that has been revealed to us about the Persons of the Trinity tells us about the One and Only God.

Everything that we know about Jesus, and everything that we know about the Holy Spirit is truth about the One God. Whenever we think of God, the Father, we must think also of the Son and of the Spirit. As Dr. Donald Baillie put it, ' The God who was incarnate in Christ dwells in us through the Holy Spirit ; and that is the secret of Christian life '.

Yes, the secret of Christian *life*, not merely of Christian theology. In all the days ' after Trinity ', we must be exploring the meaning of this God, not only by thinking about Him but, also and especially, by allowing Him to do for us all that He does as Father, Son, Spirit. We shall not finish that task before Advent comes round again ; we shall not finish it (even if we live for many years), until we meet Him face to face, and discover what it really means to have had our access in Christ through the one Spirit unto the Father.

First Sunday After Trinity

The Faith that Saves

By the Reverend Roderick Bethune, D.D., Edinburgh

' Thy faith hath saved thee ; go in peace.'—Lk 7^{50}.

These words were spoken by our Lord in the house of a Pharisee named Simon. Why Simon should have invited Him to his house is a more difficult question to answer than why our Lord accepted the invitation. No opportunity of winning men must be missed ; and who could tell what chances would offer themselves in a company of Pharisees ? But to say why Simon invited our Lord is quite another matter. If he chose to invite Him because he regarded Him as something of a celebrity, why did he fail to show Him the courtesies which any host showed to any guest ? If, on the other hand, he invited Him in order that, in company with his

fellow-Pharisees, he might put questions calculated to embarrass Him, his plan miscarried, for, before the party was very old, the initiative passed from the host to his Guest.

Whatever Simon's reason for the invitation he and his colleagues were not likely soon to forget what happened. The character of the evening was changed by the arrival of a woman whose past reputation was not unknown to Simon. Though uninvited, she was apparently free, according to Oriental custom, to enter any house where a feast was in progress. Assuming that she had come in the hope of receiving food, Simon had observed her without comment; but, when she advanced to where our Lord reclined at table and proceeded to wash His feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair and then to anoint them with ointment, he found certain questions forming themselves in his mind, particularly concerning the character of his Guest who, very much to his surprise, allowed such a woman to behave towards Him in such a manner. But our Lord, reading Simon's thoughts, told him the parable of the two debtors and so brought him to acknowledge that such conduct sometimes sprang from a deep sense of indebtedness. What the woman had been before that she was no longer; and, recognizing her indebtedness to One who had wholly transformed her life, she was simply expressing her gratitude. Simon and his friends had to confess that the woman was different from what they had believed her to be. As an explanation of the transformation, the chief Guest said to her in their hearing, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace'.

1. Who of us can fail to be interested in the suggestion made here that there is power in the Lord Jesus Christ to transform life? The woman who intruded herself into Simon's house was only one example—none knew better than Simon and his friends—of what was happening on every hand. Not only were moral failures such as she starting afresh, but the sick and the sad, who had seen so many of their plans denied fulfilment, and the burdened, who had persuaded themselves that life was not only hard but unjust, were facing life, in the power communicated by the Lord Jesus, with zest and relish.

2. How is this power which so clearly belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ communicated to and appropriated by individual men and women? To Simon and his friends the answer was supplied when, in their hearing, our Lord, addressing the woman, declared, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace'. Aware that power belonged to the Lord Jesus, and finding that He, by what He was, evoked her trust, she did something which resulted in His power being communicated to and appropriated by her.

What did she do? 'Thy faith', declared our Lord, 'hath saved thee'. Does that simply mean that she held some intellectual belief about the Lord Jesus and, so doing, found His promises come true in her experience? It cannot simply mean that, for we have known men and women who have held some intellectual belief about Jesus but in whose life, as a result, there was little evidence of power, and concerning whom we could not say with any honesty that their faith had saved them. Faith, in this woman's case, while it must have included an intellectual element, meant, fundamentally, a surrender of her life. Committing herself wholly to the Lord Jesus, she experienced the expulsive power of a new affection so that old things passed away and all things became new. In that sense, her faith had saved her.

3. If such a declaration made in their hearing indicated to Simon and to his friends how the power of the Lord Jesus Christ was communicated to and appropriated by individual men and women, did it not indicate also how they themselves might experience such power and explain why they had not hitherto experienced it? Through the grace of God there is a power available, just as, through the grace of God, it is possible for men to appropriate it. But only when by faith, by an act of commitment, they seek to appropriate it, does such power become operative in their lives.

That fact is driven home to us by many passages in the New Testament and not least by a well-known declaration of St. Paul. 'I know', he wrote, 'whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day'. That declaration contains not just one statement of importance but two. 'I have believed', St Paul wrote, and 'I have committed'. Had faith been for him only an intellectual belief, he would never have been able to say, 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me'. He was able to say that because he had first said, not only 'I have believed', but 'I have committed'. His faith, considered in that sense, had saved him—not in the sense, of course, that by his act of commitment he had saved himself, but rather in the sense that by his act of commitment he had made it possible for the Lord Jesus Christ to save him.

Salvation, Professor Rowley has reminded us, is both a divine and a human act. 'If', he says, illustrating his point, 'a man wishes to travel from Manchester to London by train, it is a necessary condition of his journey that he should board the train, but he would be very foolish if he supposed that his entering the train would of itself get him to London, and that he could dispense with the engine. The power that would get him to London would be the power of the engine; yet

it would not succeed in getting him there if he were not on the train.'

What is hindering our salvation is not the Divine part in that great act, but the human part, our own willing and unreserved response, the commitment of our whole selves to the promises which God in Jesus Christ makes to every man. If we could fill up that which is lacking, we should go in peace, even as this woman did, for we should find, as she found, that our faith had saved us.

To go in peace is probably what all of us wish to do, for each of us has his own battle to fight, his own burden to carry, his own obligation to discharge. But how can we go in peace in face of such a battle, such a burden and such an obligation, for peace, as some one has said, is the possession of adequate resources, and that, in many instances, is what we are not conscious of possessing. Is it not worth noting, however, that before our Lord said to this woman, ' Go in peace ', He said, ' thy faith hath saved thee ' ? Adequate resources are the consequence of commitment. And the act of commitment is within the power of all of us.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

How God Keeps His Word

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A., CATHCART

' Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord . . . might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus . . . that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom. . . .'—Ezr 1^1.

It is a mistake to imagine that God can only act through His dedicated servants. True, His greatest purposes are served by those who deliberately co-operate with Him in faith and obedience. Livingstone, Schweitzer, Elizabeth Fry, Florence Nightingale and a multitude more consciously made themselves tools for the doing of His will and through them great beneficent and redemptive works were done.

Such men and women, however, have not been God's only agents. He has employed all kinds of people in His service—people of meagre faith, of hostile faith and of no faith at all. And the most outstanding example of God's power to act outside of the realm of professed faith is the Persian emperor, Cyrus, to whom our chapter refers.

Cyrus no doubt was an enlightened dictator but he was a pagan. He may have been moved by benevolent and humanitarian motives or he may have been crafty enough to see that he could only have a great empire if it consisted of peoples whose legitimate aspirations were satisfied and therefore were contented. It matters not. Enough that, whatever his intentions, his actions served a purpose greater than he knew.

For so many years the Jews had been in captivity that now only children's children remained of those who, seventy years before, had left the homeland. One thing had kept the lamp of faith and hope burning throughout the dark and disappointing years. It was the promise of God. He had said that one day they would return to the land of their fathers.

And see how that faith was justified ! A pagan monarch who knew nothing of the promise, and, even if he had, would have cared less, became the instrument in the hands of God for the keeping of His word.

God keeps His Word. Perplexing and unpredictable are the ways of God. We dare not lay down the lines that He will follow. Nor can we even guess at the manner of His acting. But we can be sure about His faithfulness. He keeps His word.

From our human experience we recognize how fundamental is this type of faithfulness. Life becomes quite chaotic unless we keep our word. Appointments, dates and times must be strictly observed. Otherwise we have no secure ground on which to build our human relationships. Husbands and wives, children and parents, employers and workmen, citizens and rulers rely finally on this, that they will honour their obligations to one another.

One of the most daunting and tormenting factors unsettling the nations of the world at this hour is the fear that Governments will not honour their pledges. Mr. Truman tells us that of the decisions to which the allied nations put their names at the Potsdam Conference, Russia has broken thirty-two. And how can free and normal intercourse between nations be conducted without the confidence that what they say they will do ?

Both the Bible and human experience tell us that what is essential for man is also necessary for God. As man must be able to depend on his brother man, so man can rely on God—but infinitely more. If man many times fails his brother, God always keeps His word.

Strange, indeed, that we should ever doubt it ! The material world is a perpetual demonstration of how reliable are the ways of God. We can tell the story of the sun, its origin and probable destiny, because the Creator's behaviour towards the physical universe is so dependable. We can plot the course of the planets with such accuracy that we can declare where they once were or are sure to be in the future, so undeviating is God's fulfilment of His own laws. The expanding world of scientific discovery and invention rests upon this

assumption, never doubted, that God keeps His word.

Equally true is it in God's dealing with His children. This is what the Bible persistently proclaims. The Bible is a book of promises. Men heard the word of the Lord and gave it out as the assured pledge of the Most High. It tells of these promises and of how they were fulfilled. To a great extent the history of religious experience has consisted of the way in which men leaned on God's faithful word and found it to be true.

We need to-day to be building on the promises. They were meant for people like us. In our weariness—'Come unto me, and I will give you rest'; in our troubles—'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth'; in our sorrows—'As a mother comforteth her children, so the Lord'; in our pains—'Thou shalt forget thy misery, and remember it as waters that pass away'; in our lonely struggles for virtue—'I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee'.

Rest on the promises until you discover like David Livingstone that they are the word of the strictest honour. He keeps His word.

Therefore, His delays are not denials. For delays there are. Seventy years was a long time for the Jews to wait. Not until the children's children had risen into manhood and womanhood did the glad day dawn. We know how many hearts failed in the intervening years and faith perished.

But God has His own ideas for the long waiting. The Jews had to learn what it meant to be faithful to God in a foreign land. Their history shows that they had to preserve their identity while living among people of other faiths and other ways. They could never have retained their characteristics unless thay had been disciplined by just such years of captivity.

So very often when God appears to be saying 'No', He is delaying for a very good reason, not denying.

The longer we live, the more are we impressed with one outstanding characteristic of His nature. It is not His power, although who, living in this modern age with its unfolding of the dormant forces of Nature, can fail to be amazed at God's power? Nor is it merely His love, although to all who share His grace in Jesus Christ, that love becomes the more wonderful with the passing days. No, it is His patience. How it does not break beneath the strain of man's vanity, his intellectual denials, his unrepentant disobedience, his betrayals, one will never be able to imagine. What strength there is in that patience, what love! How awesome it is to us who believe in Him, who have accepted the offer of His grace in Jesus Christ, who depend on His redeeming love for our salvation and yet who deliberately neglect, deny and forsake Him. Still nothing happens to us. He keeps on bearing with us. The incredible patience of God!

Now, if this is an essential part of the nature of God and if we are to dwell in full understanding with Him forever, there must be some correspondence between Him and us. We can never be at home with a God like this unless we have learned that patience and it has become part of our nature too.

His delays, therefore, must have this object in view. His answer is sure to come. His making good His promise is the joy of those who have developed the capacity to wait for it.

His fulfilments are greater than we dreamed. The Jews could never have anticipated that their send-off from the land of their captivity could have been with such goodwill. Earthly men can only think of earthly means of emancipation. God's ways are beyond our highest expectations. For here they were being sent back home loaded with gifts. Gold, silver, horses, cattle and goods were being lavishly bestowed on them. And the vessels for the Temple, what about them? They were given them too. Amazing!

That is how God fulfils His promises. Read your Bible and see how true it is. Jacob had seemed to lose his well-beloved Joseph but, that the word of the Lord might be fulfilled, he was given him back. Amid what unpredictable splendour! Moses accepted the promises of God and never dreamed that their realization would bring him into such intimate relationship with God that he would become the recipient of the eternal law. The disciples staked everything on the word of Jesus when He said, 'No man shall leave everything for My sake and the gospel's but shall receive an hundredfold now . . . and in the world to come eternal life'. The honouring of that word meant for them the leadership of a world-wide Church and the veneration of countless men.

To the reverent and devoted soul it is always the same. It may be that in the estimate of the world the fulfilments of God may not appear spectacular but in the eyes of the humble believer they are more than he could ask or think.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Growing Up

BY THE REVEREND RODERIC DUNKERLEY, B.A., B.D., PH.D., WORTHING

'But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.'—Eph 4^{15}.

'But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'—2 P 3^{18}.

Christian growth is a glorious idea and it should be a great experience and real joy for us all. There

are many other places in the New Testament where we find it urgently set before us. 'As newborn babes', we read, 'desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby' (1 P 2^2). And the Hebrews are reproached that they have not grown up as they should have done: 'For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat' (He 5^{12}).

This challenge to growth in Christian experience and this reproach for failure are badly needed to-day. All professing Christians should be progressing Christians. But how often we keep on in the same old way at the same old level year after year—content with the 'first principles' and the ABC of the gospel—satisfied to drift along and maintain our *status quo*—unwilling for the meat diet necessary for mature Christians—refusing to grow up, both in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord.

In his beautiful little book *High Country* Alistair Maclean makes the interesting suggestion that the Parable of the Pounds is really part of the teaching of Jesus upon this matter. It is the story of two men who grew and of one who wouldn't. The three men each received a pound. Number one adventured with his and turned it into ten. Number two toiled with his and turned it into five. Number three buried his with the result that his pound remained a pound. And Jesus says—This is tragedy, pure and terrible, for the purpose that My Father has in giving is that whatever is given may grow. And the question for us is—Are we using our gifts and talents, are we seizing our opportunities, and so growing in Christian faith and experience? Or are we content to 'stay put' and remain at what we may call the napkin stage of life, remaining as we have been, no further advanced in holy things than we were a year ago—or ten years ago? Are we rejoicing in growing up—or refusing to make any effort to grow at all?

Let us consider what it means to grow in grace. It surely means to grow in graciousness of attitude and action towards others, to cultivate charity of thought, to be generous in deeds but in judgments also, to become more kindly and courteous, to be considerate of others' feelings and wishes, to be gentle with their failings and forgiving not once or twice but many times, to strive earnestly against the hardheartedness to which most of us are prone, to avoid quick and harsh criticisms and ugly gossip, to fight against carelessness of disposition and the couldn't-care-less way of regarding other people's needs and problems, whether individually or in the mass. Have we grown more gracious in such ways as these since our last birthday? Shall we pray that we may so grow before our next?

One aspect of such graciousness is, of course, clear and careful thinking, and we should certainly desire to grow in the grace of clarity of thought. So many Christians are so woolly-minded, so dull-headed—they put their minds to bed and tuck them in tight, as Dr. Fosdick has said. We must pray for the grace to see the other side of the question, to sit where other folks sit and look at things from their point of view. We must strive to conquer our prejudices and refuse to give a dog a bad name and hang him. We must try to think things out, even though it means reversing our previous views and changing our attitudes and sometimes even our loyalties. We should greatly cherish St. Paul's fine precept—'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things' (Ph 4^8).

Easier said than done, it may be said. Yes, but that is where the other part of St. Peter's challenge comes in. 'Grow in grace, and *in the knowledge of the Lord.*' We must be willing to learn more of Him who is the Lord of all grace, and who is able to make all grace abound unto us. How well do we know Him as He was in the days of His flesh, how well do we know the Gospels which tell us of Him and record His sayings, on the keeping of which He continually laid such stress? Too many of us are content with knowing snippets of them, instead of endeavouring to learn more and ever more of them and of their significance for us to-day. Are we willing to grow in this grace of understanding, and of acceptance, obeying them more faithfully than hitherto, and bringing every thought into captivity to the mind of Christ?

And it is not only in knowledge of the written word that we are to grow. He is the living Lord, who still speaks in the hearts of those who will listen and obey. He said to the first disciples, 'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now' (Jn 16^{12}), and they did grow in knowledge of Him when they met with Him in spirit—we see Peter and Paul and the rest constantly being led on into fuller understanding of His will. And it should be our experience too. We should desire and expect and be grateful for a teaching ministry. Sometimes people say, 'That was a fine sermon—I agreed with every word of it!' But it is perhaps the sermons with which you do not agree at first that may be His call to you to learn more and to grow up in understanding and loyalty. Sermons should stretch our minds and touch our consciences and make us eager to

press on, not as though we had already attained or were already perfect.

Martin Luther once wrote : ' A voice within me calls imperiously, Come higher and still higher '. It sounds within us all. May we have grace to listen and obey, and so to grow in grace and the knowledge of the Lord.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Christian Fidelity

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR GEORGE JOHNSTON, B.D., PH.D., EMMANUEL COLLEGE, THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

' But the fruit of the Spirit is . . . faithfulness.'—Gal 5^{22} (R.S.V.).

1. There is a huge grave pit near Ossossane on the shores of Georgian Bay, Ontario, where one day a vast heap of Huron Indian bones was discovered. By dint of exploring the village sites nearby and of examining the remains gathered together in the magnificent museum at Midland, one can learn to picture these wild savages amongst whom the first American saints, Brébeuf and his brethren, laboured just three hundred and fifty-five years ago. ' Faithful unto death ' they were, these French priests who sought to make a new Christian France in the wilderness of Canada.

Our text from Galatians is itself like some pit where great words lie, for there must be many even in our churches who would regard the string of nine words as no better than a string of dry bones that say little to their imaginations. ' Love, joy, peace, patience . . . faithfulness, gentleness, self-control.' But surely St. Paul would not have listed them unless in his own experience he had found out how important they were. What or who, then, impressed him with the need for fidelity ?

2. It is not difficult to discover the answer to our question. First, there was a matter that meant life or death to the entire Church in Paul's judgment : were non-Jews to be allowed into the Church only by becoming full Jews first of all ? That involved circumcising the men and boys, and compelling all of them to use nothing but kosher food and to observe the Mosaic law about marriage. It was a bitter contest, the actual course of which is obscure.

Paul points out quite clearly, however, that at one stage Peter, leader of the Jewish Christian mission, had freely eaten with the uncircumcised Christians of Antioch. When certain men came down from Jerusalem and insisted that Peter must stop this practice, Peter gave in. ' I told Peter to his face ', wrote Paul to the Galatians, ' that these people were not sincere. You have lived like a Gentile yourself (and think what that has got you into) ; now you would compel Gentile Christians to live like Jews. Why ? None of us will be saved by circumcision or by kosher meat ; we shall be saved by the grace of God only, through faith in Christ as Lord.'

Paul saw this issue with real spiritual insight, for it is the issue of *apartheid* : May negro Christians sit down at the same Lord's Table with white Christians ? May Boers eat with Bantus ? Must Jewish Christians eat only with other Jewish Christians ? Yet we also claim that there is one Church of God, that Christ has broken down the walls of every kind of *apartheid*, and is our peace ! Bitterly Paul opposed this travesty of the gospel. Fidelity to Jesus Christ was at stake, and that is why fidelity was of such significance to Paul and the Church.

Next, we read in Acts how Barnabas approached Paul about a return visit to Cyprus, Galatia and parts of Asia to see the converts of the first missionary tour. ' I propose to take my cousin John Mark along ', said Barnabas. ' Then you will go without me,' replied Paul. What was the trouble in this instance ?

John Mark had accompanied the two apostles on that first trip, but at Perga in Pamphylia he turned back to Jerusalem. Evidently Paul regarded this act as desertion, and the author of Acts says, ' he would not go with them to the work'. John Mark refused, that is, to proceed on the mission which had been sent out by the Church of Antioch.

A faithful man must have the faith in him, the true faith, the faith as it is in Jesus. But that faith includes the love to communicate good news of God to the lost. Our Christian faith must be missionary or it perishes. Paul saw that issue with profound insight. Whoever says that he is on principle against missions is self-convicted ; the pure gospel is not in him and his Christianity is a sham and a mockery. That is why fidelity is so necessary for Paul the missionary and for the Church.

Fortunately there seems to be a postscript to this tale of John Mark. If we may judge by Paul's letters to the Colossians and to Philemon, and perhaps by the Gospel called Mark, John Mark got a second chance and became once more a fellow-worker with Paul. Fidelity can be learned, and Paul knew how to forgive.

Apartheid and missions provided incentives, therefore, but not merely on realistic this-worldly grounds. For in the mind of the Apostle the fundamental question concerned the will of God in

such matters. We may take it that Paul concluded to the need for faithfulness in a Christian because his God is faithful.

He told the Thessalonians that they could depend on God to give them strength against wicked men and to deliver them from the devil; 'He who calls you is faithful, and He will do it'. He told the Corinthians, 'God is faithful, and He will not let you be tempted beyond your strength'. It is a wonderful cause of security to believe that amid all the changes of life and in face of unknown terrors there is in heaven One who remains in control, One who can be trusted. We may defend it on the ground that Nature's laws abide, that our Creator is consistent, that the moral law also cannot be broken; figs are not gathered from thorns, neither does an evil man produce good fruit out of his heart's treasure. And in history the evil that men do lives after them to bedevil the conferences of the nations. Paul believed in Divine fidelity because he read history with the eyes of Amos, Isaiah, Hosea and the other prophets of Israel; God had never forsaken His covenant people of Abraham and his seed, but is for ever merciful, for ever reliable. Even the Cross of the Jew Jesus demonstrated that God was involved, since in no other way could He inaugurate a New Covenant that would fulfil the promises of the Old. A Christian is a man bound to the oath and character of this New Covenant, bound to the Lordship of Christ (who loved me and gave Himself up for me); and so his whole life must become an imitation of Jesus, a being clothed with His spiritual virtues: and fidelity is one of these.

3. If this is how we may begin to see why fidelity is in the list, well and good; yet no sermon is an adequate clothing of a Christian virtue. Each one of us must clothe it himself in terms of his own life.

From the Gospels we can tell that Jesus expected a judge to dispense justice (are you a lawyer?), a servant to be diligent (who employs you?), a shepherd to be watchful and, if need be, to rescue the lost (are you a pastor?), a book-keeper to be honest (are you in an office? an accountant?), a giver to be generous (like the folk in Dumfries who want to reach a higher percentage, or like the people who run a Wells campaign?), a praying man to be humble, a disciple to be like his teacher, an heir to the Kingdom to be a son or a daughter of the Heavenly Father. You cannot serve mammon and also God. But like John Mark any one of us may learn how to be reliable, dependable, trustworthy, not only in church affairs but also in our homes and businesses. Whether you be black or white, male or female, single or married, old or young, clever or ordinary, God wants you like Christ.

Entre Nous

A Preacher on Preaching

Preaching does not become any easier as the years go by. The Rev. James Wright writes: 'We are of necessity telling an old, old story and dealing often with similar themes. . . . A coin used too often and too long will not work the slot machine'. That is why the preacher always turns with hope and expectation to each volume of the Warrack Lectures. The latest volume is that by the Rev. James Wright, entitled *A Preacher's Questionnaire* (Saint Andrew Press; 7s. 6d. net).

This book is the fruit of many years of experience; and the questions it seeks to ask and to answer are: Why should we preach? What should we preach? To whom should we preach? How should we preach? What results should we expect? Let us, then, hear the notes of this book.

Mr. Wright knows the limitations of preaching. He tells how in his youth a popular preacher advised him always carefully to choose the hymn before the sermon with a view to conditioning the congregation to receive the sermon. 'It is', he said, 'like stropping your razor before you shave'. Such a man was prepared 'to use an act of praise to Almighty God to set the stage for his star turn'. The sermon is an act of worship, and not a performance.

Mr. Wright stresses the need of apologetic preaching, that is of preaching which is designed to explain and to expound the faith. 'Christianity was never in greater need than now of being explained and defended.' 'The chief danger to the Church is not the energy and ingenuity of its opponents but the ignorance of its adherents.'

Mr. Wright has some exceptionally interesting things to say in regard to the presentation of Jesus Christ as Saviour. He rightly insists that different temperaments in people require a different presentation of the gospel. 'There are those to whom Christ the Saviour of the individual will most strongly appeal and those to whom Christ the Saviour of society will seem most magnetic.' 'A man with a slight sense of personal sin or no such sense might be filled with shame before a picture of a refugee camp. Jesus would see there a genuine

repentance.' Mr. Wright has here raised a matter about which some really strenuous thinking might be done.

No true preaching can lack the note of joy. Mr. Wright tells of the young man who after a service of worship said to his father that he was minded to go round to the vestry to thank the minister for the excellent funeral service; and of the beadle who came forward with the preacher's gown saying: 'Will you wear the shroud, sir?' Mr. Wright tells of a woman's verdict on a certain preacher: 'Listening to that man is like drawing in your chair to an oot fire (a fire which has gone out).' It was Neville Cardus, the famous writer, who said: 'If I know that my Redeemer liveth, it is not on the Church's testimony, but because of what Handel affirms'. Mr. Wright reminds the preacher never to lose the radiance of the gospel.

There is another way of putting that. On the cover of a reprint of C. S. Lewis's 'Mere Christianity' there is the claim that 'here is a book that makes religion exciting and stimulating to the ordinary man'. Mr. Wright sees that as the great objective of all preaching. The prophets were not persecuted because they were dull, but because they were dangerous. 'Men do not stone those who only put them to sleep.'

Mr. Wright has a word to say to save the preacher from discouragement. It sometimes happens that there is no improvement in some person's life and conduct so that we are tempted to say: 'He is a dead loss and a handicap to the cause'. Rather we ought to say: 'God has not finished His work with him yet, and I must so preach to encourage him not to lose heart, but to continue to submit himself with hope to the treatment of God's Spirit'.

It may be that one of the most valuable things in the book is the quotation of Earl Haig's tribute to Dr. G. S. Duncan, who was his chaplain in the First World War: 'Well, I can truly say that you were a great help to me in putting things into proper perspective on Sundays'. The preacher has no higher function than to enable men to see in their true perspective the things which are for a moment and the things which are for ever.

This is a wise and a kindly book, which will be a guide to the young preacher and a rekindling of the flame to the preacher who is in the midst of the years.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

C. S. Lewis

It is ten years since C. S. Lewis wrote a religious book. It does not seem to be as long as that, because we keep on re-reading those others. Everything that Professor Lewis writes is welcome, if only because we know it will be characterized by a new and intriguing approach. This book is about the Psalms—*Reflections on the Psalms* (Bles; 12s. 6d. net)—and once more we have an intriguing book. He starts by disclaiming any specialized knowledge: 'I write for the unlearned about things in which I am unlearned myself'. That is a foolish statement, because in order to write helpfully on the Psalms what is needed is a wide and sympathetic knowledge of human nature, and that is what C. S. Lewis undoubtedly has. The man who wrote 'The Screwtape Letters' is the man to write about the Psalms. I like the 'edge' in this book. I do not think I agree with everything that is said, nor will any one else, but we shall all be stung into new thinking, and that is what is important. C. S. Lewis writes on Judgment in the Psalms, Curses, Death, and so on—twelve chapters and nearly all of them on the really difficult subjects which one is apt to leave alone. This is a good book for preachers to read: it will regerminate that freshness of thought of which we all of us at times find ourselves in need.

N. H. SNAITH

Christ's Teaching

'His [Christ's] teaching therefore cannot be grasped by the intellect alone, cannot be "got up" as if it were a subject . . . He will not be, in the way we want, "pinned down". The attempt is (again, I mean no irreverence) like trying to bottle a sunbeam. . . .'

'There is almost no "letter" in the words of Jesus. Taken by a literalist, He will always prove the most elusive of teachers. Systems cannot keep up with that darting illumination. No net less wide than a man's whole heart, nor less fine of mesh than love, will hold the sacred Fish.' [1]

Immortality

'For we are so little reconciled to time that we are even astonished at it. "How he's grown!" we exclaim, "How time flies!" as though the universal form of our experience were again and again a novelty. It is as strange as if a fish were repeatedly surprised at the wetness of water. And that would be strange indeed; unless of course the fish were destined to become, one day, a land animal.' [2]

[1] C. S. Lewis, *Reflections on the Psalms*, 113, 119.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 138.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.